

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/2889>

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

Advocata Nostra: Central Italian Paintings of Mary as the Second Eve, c. 1335-c. 1445

Anne Dunlop

This thesis is a close examination and analysis of the creation and reception of a group of eighteen Central Italian paintings of the Madonna with Eve presented reclining at her feet, images which draw on one of the fundamental themes of Mary's cult, her role as the Second Eve.

Modern writers have sometimes been taken aback by these panels; in recent studies of women in history, Mary and Eve are often assumed to have been defining stereotypes of positive and negative feminine behaviour, and these works make a blatant juxtaposition of the two. Yet this imagery was obviously attractive to Trecento and Quattrocento patrons: this paradox lies at the heart of this thesis, which seeks to determine what these paintings might have meant to those who commissioned them and who first worshipped before them.

To do so, this thesis begins by introducing the questions raised by the works; it then discusses textual and oral traditions linking Mary and Eve for Trecento and Quattrocento viewers, in order to suggest a range of possible associations for the imagery. There are then four case studies, intended to particularise the general themes of the pairing through specific images and contexts. The first focuses on Ambrogio Lorenzetti's frescoes at the former Cistercian abbey of S. Galgano, which were created, it is suggested here, by a member of that community in Mary's honour. The next chapter looks at the political and eschatological implications of images of Mary's rule as the Second Eve in the Papal States, discussing frescoes in S. Agostino, Montefalco, S. Gregorio Maggiore, Spoleto, and the Camposanto in Pisa, as well as a panel attributed to Carlo da Camerino, now in Cleveland, Ohio. The following chapter examines the 1371 Madonna of Graces in Magione, near Perugia, and the knightly devotion of its secular, aristocratic donor, who is here identified; the detached fresco from S. Severino Marche is also briefly mentioned. And the final chapter focuses on the only image securely linked to a female religious community, Lippo Vanni's 1358 triptych for the Dominican nuns of Sant'Aurea in Rome, which offers a basis for examining the complicated question of female viewership for images of Mary and Eve.

Together, these studies allow a series of wider conclusions to be drawn about these paintings, including some of the smaller panels not discussed in depth in the main text. In conclusion, it is argued that these images of Eve at Mary's feet provided different groups of Trecento and Quattrocento Christians with a positive way in which to stress their own human weakness, encouraging Mary to intercede on their behalf, as she had done, first and foremost, for Eve.

There is also an appendix providing additional information on those Sienese, Lucchese, and Florentine panels less discussed in the main body of the text.

**Advocata Nostra: Central Italian Paintings of Mary as the Second Eve,
c. 1335-c. 1445**

Anne Dunlop

**Master of Arts, University of British Columbia
Licence, Université Lumière-Lyon II**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Warwick, Department of History of Art
March, 1997**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iv
Declaration	v
Abbreviations	vi
List of Illustrations	vii
 INTRODUCTION: QUESTIONS AND GOALS	 1
 I. LINKING MARY AND EVE	 18
I. The First Developments	21
II. Latin Debates: Recapitulation, Ambivalence, and Contrast	29
III. The Vernacular Tradition: Patronage, Advocacy, and Blood Ties	40
IV. Conclusions	45
 II. 'ADVOCATA NOSTRA: THE FRESCOES OF S. GALGANO AT MONTESIEPI	 46
I. The Saint, His Images, and the Frescoes	49
II. Cistercian S. Galgano	56
III. Queen of the Cistercian Court	61
IV. Exules Filii Evae	71
V. Patronage, Vanni Salimbeni, and Ristoro della Selvatella	79
VI. Conclusions	87
 III. QUEEN OF HEAVEN: MONTEFALCO, PISA, AND CLEVELAND	 91
I. The Frescoes at Montefalco and Pisa	92
II. The Assumption and the Coronation	98
III. Queen of the Apocalypse	108
IV. Conclusions	121
 IV. 'HONOREM TIBI PANDIS IN COELI PALATIO:' S. MARIA DELLE GRAZIE, MAGIONE	 123
I. The Madonna of Graces	126
II. Magione and Military Men	129
III. Francesco Signore and the Aspirations of the Lesser Nobility	134
IV. Crusading, Casali, and the Madonna of Graces	144
V. Eve and Indulgences	149
VI. Conclusions, and a Note about S. Severino Marche	154

V. 'VIRGO MATER MULTARUM VIRGINUM:' A TRIPTYCH FOR THE CONVENT OF S. AUREA	158
I. Saint Aurea and the Triptych	160
II. S. Aurea and the Friars	166
III. The Triptych and the Community Beyond the Cloister Grille	172
IV. The Dominicans, the Orsini, and the Anguillara	184
V. Conclusions, and a Final Word about Female Viewers	188
 CONCLUSIONS	 192
 APPENDIX: ADDITIONAL PANELS OF THE VIRGIN WITH EVE AT HER FEET	 208
 SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	 229
 ILLUSTRATIONS	 242

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has had a complicated gestation. It was begun, after a Masters at the University of British Columbia, under Professor Andrew Martindale at the University of East Anglia, and following Professor Martindale's sudden and tragic death in May, 1995, it has been completed under the supervision of Professor Julian Gardner at Warwick. I am grateful to both for their gracious and intelligent supervision.

I would also like to acknowledge the staff of the State Archives in both Siena and Perugia, as well as the staff of the Deputazione per l'Umbria, especially Giordana Benazzi. Fernando Sorci, Sacristan of S. Maria delle Grazie in Magione, deserves my warm thanks for helping me to photograph the work, and for generously providing me with several local studies of the image. The curators of the museums and galleries holding the panels have also been unfailing helpful, and Anthony Luttrell, Fiorella Gioffredi Superbi, and Andrea de' Marchi were kind enough to answer research inquiries, and the research itself was made possible by a series of awards, for which I thank the ORS, the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission, the Canadian Social Sciences and Research Council, the Québec Fonds pour la Formation des Chercheurs, and UEA. My parents and Clara and William Wood were excellent traveling companions.

Special thanks are due to Louise Bourdua, Elena De Luca, Sandy Heslop, Denise Oleksijczuk, Debra Pincus, Frances Thomas, Margit Tøfner, Cordelia Warr, and Bill Wood, whose questions and comments have helped to shape this work.

DECLARATION

Two sections of this thesis incorporate material which has been used for an earlier degree or which is being published elsewhere. The discussion of Carlo da Camerino's panel presented in the Introduction is based on the first ten pages of my Master's thesis at the University of British Columbia, presented in 1992, although this earlier material has been extensively revised and rewritten. An abbreviated version of the material on S. Galgano, presented in Chapter Two, will appear as: "A Cistercian Romance: The Frescoes of S. Galgano at Montesiepi" Memory and Oblivion: Acts of the XXIXth International Congress of the History of Art, eds. A.W. Reinink et al. (Dordrecht, 1997). This article focuses, however, on the Cistercians, and not, as is here the case, on the imagery of Mary and Eve.

ABBREVIATIONS

N.B. The style used in the text is that of the American Modern Languages Association, although the publisher has been omitted in footnotes, in accordance with British practice. Unless otherwise indicated here, abbreviations used are those of the Bibliographie d'histoire de l'art.

- AASS** Société des Bollandistes, Acta Sanctorum. Antwerp: Joannes Meusium, 1642-reprint Brussels, 1966-
- AHMA** Guido Maria Dreves and Clemens Blume, eds. Analecta hymnica medii aevi. 55 vols. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland), 1886-1922.
- AFP** Archivium Fratrum Praedicatorum. Rome: Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1932-
- ASI** Archivio Storico Italiano. Florence: Gio. Pietro Viessieux, later Deputazione Toscana di Storia Patria, 1842-
- BDSPU** Bollettino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria. Perugia: Società di Storia Patria, later Deputazione di Storia Patria, 1895-
- CC** Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis. Turnholti: Brepolis, 1966-
- DBI** Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-
- Guldan** Ernst Guldan. Eva und Maria: Eine Antithese als Bildmotiv. Graz-Cologne: Hermann Böhlaus, 1966.
- PL** J.P. Migne, ed. Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina. 221 vols, 5 modern supplementa. Paris: Garnier Freres, 1844-1890.
- RDI** Rationes Decimarum Italiae nei secoli XIII et XIV. 13 vols. and maps. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1933-1941.
- RIS** L.A. Muratori, ed. Rerum Italicarum Scriptores. 34 vols. Milan, 1723-1751; Reprint Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1900-1917.
- Schiller** Gertrude Schiller. Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst. Band 4, 2 Maria. Gutersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1980.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Carlo da Camerino. Madonna and Child with Angels, c. 1390-1400. 191.2 x 98.7 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art.
2. Carlo da Camerino. Madonna and Child, Detail: Gabriel (b&w).
3. Carlo da Camerino. Madonna and Child, Detail: Michael and A Male Saint (b&w).
4. Carlo da Camerino. Madonna and Child, Detail: Gabriel (colour).
5. Carlo da Camerino. Madonna and Child, Detail: Michael and A Male Saint (colour).
6. Fra Angelico. Altarpiece of the Annunciation, c. 1332-1334. 175 x 180 cm. Museo Diocesano, Cortona.
7. Advertisement for Smirnoff Vodka, 1996. Dimensions variable.
8. Niccolò di Tommaso. The Fall, 1372. Vault Fresco, Convento del Tau, Pistoia.
9. Niccolò di Tommaso. The Labours of Adam and Eve, 1372. Convento del Tau, Pistoia.
10. Circle of Simone Martini and Lippo Memmi. Thomas Aquinas in Glory, c. 1335-45. Santa Caterina, Pisa.
11. Bartolo di Fredi. Augustine in Glory, c. 1380. Sant'Agostino, Montalcino.
12. Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Maestà Lunette, c. 1336. San Galgano, Montesiepi.
13. Rotunda of San Galgano, Montesiepi: Exterior with Annexed Trecento Frescoed Chapel at Left.
14. Rotunda of San Galgano, Montesiepi, with Annexed Trecento Frescoed Chapel: Groundplan.
15. Diagram of Extant Fresco, San Galgano.
16. Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Altar wall with Maestà and Annunciation.
17. Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Vault Prophets.

18.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Galgano's Vision of Michael in Rome.

19.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Sinopia: Galgano's Vision of Michael in Rome.

20.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Sinopia Fragment of Roman Scene, North Wall.

21.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Michael Leads Galgano to Mary's Court (b&w).

22.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Michael Leads Galgano to Mary's Court (colour).

23.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Michael Leads Galgano, Detail: The Three Clerics.

24.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Procession of Saints of S. Galgano.

25.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Maestà, Detail: Active Charity and Benedict of Montecassino.

26.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Maestà, Detail: Contemplative Charity and Bernard of Clairvaux.

27.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Maestà, Detail: Eve.

28.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Maestà, Detail: Fragment of Mary as a Queen with Sceptre and Orb.

29.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Virgin Annunciate.

30.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Sinopia: Virgin Annunciate.

31.Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Workshop. Annunciation, Detail: Inserted Donor.

32.Unknown Sienese. Reliquary of Galgano's Head, c. 1300. Gilded copper with silverwork , champlevé enamel, and coloured stones, 101 x 36.5 cm. Museo dell'Opera del Duomo, Siena.

33.Duccio. Maestà, Front Central Panel, c. 1308-1311. 211 x 425 cm. Museo dell'Opera del Duomo, Siena.

34.Simone Martini. Maestà, 1315-16. 10.58 x 9.77 m. Sala del Mappamondo, Palazzo Pubblico, Siena.

35. Ambrogio Lorenzetti. Maestà, c. 1335-37. 161 x 207 cm. Pinacoteca, Massa Maritima.
36. Cola Petruccioli. Detached Frescoes of Active and Contemplative Life, 1390s. Each 315 x 70 cm. National Gallery of Hungary, Budapest.
37. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, c. 1345. App. 425 x 370 cm. Sant'Agostino, Montefalco.
38. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Mary and Christ.
39. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Left Side with Augustine and John the Evangelist.
40. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Right Side with a Bishop and John the Baptist.
41. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Ring of Flying Angels.
42. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Eve.
43. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Left Donor.
44. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Right Donor.
45. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Left Niche Saint (Anne or Elizabeth?).
46. Anonymous Sienese. Coronation of the Virgin, Detail: Right Niche Saint.
47. Piero di Puccio. Detached Fresco of the Coronation of the Virgin, 1390-91. 440 x 650 cm. Museo delle Sinopie, Camposanto, Pisa.
48. Master of the *Dormitio* of Terni. Detached Fresco of the Madonna and Child with Four Saints and Music-Making Angels, c. 1380. App. 290 x 206 cm. San Gregorio Maggiore, Spoleto.
49. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child with Francesco Signore, Six Angels, Eve, a Pilgrim, and a Poor Man. 1371. Santa Maria delle Grazie, Magione.
50. Santa Maria delle Grazie, Magione. Exterior.
51. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Close-Up.
52. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Francesco Signore.

53. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Christ, Mary, and Angels.
54. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Left Angels with Lilies and a Tower.
55. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Eve.
56. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Eve and Kneeling Pilgrim at Left.
57. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Kneeling Figure at Right.
58. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Inscription, Left.
59. Unknown Orvietan. Madonna and Child, Detail: Inscription, Right.
60. Magione of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, Magione. Exterior and Courtyard.
61. Michele di Tommè. Casali Chalice, c. 1370-1375. Gilded copper and silver with enamels. Museo Diocesano, Cortona.
62. Michele di Tommè. Casali Chalice, Detail: Stemma of Francesco Casali.
63. Cristoforo Orimina. Bible of the Anjou Kings of Naples, Genealogy of the Anjou Kings, c. 1340. University Library, Malines.
64. Cristoforo Orimina. Bible of the Anjou Kings of Naples, Robert of Anjou Surrounded by Virtues Trampling Vices, c. 1340. University Library, Malines.
65. Unknown Artist. Madonna di San Guglielmo, early Duecento. 225 x 100 cm. Abbazia di Montevergine.
66. Pietro Lorenzetti. Detached Fresco of the Madonna and Child with John the Baptist and a Knight, 1320s. San Domenico, Siena.
67. Unknown Artist of the Marches. Detached Fresco Fragment of Eve, early Quattrocento. 200 x 111 cm. Pinacoteca Comunale, San Severino Marche.
68. Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child with Saints Dominic and Aurea, 1358. 159 x 208 cm. Santi Domenico e Sisto, Rome.
69. Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Top Left Wing: Aurea is Tortured by the Emperor (colour).
70. Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Top Left Wing: Aurea is Tortured by the Emperor (b&w).

- 71.Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Bottom Left Wing: Aurea and her Companions Restore the Life of the Artisan's Son with their Prayers.
- 72.Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Right Wing: Aurea and her Companions are Tortured; Aurea is Thrown into the Sea with a Millstone at her Neck.
- 73.Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Central Panel.
- 74.Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Eve and Gradino Inscription.
- 75.Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Eve and Fictive Predella.
- 76.Lippo Vanni. Triptych of the Madonna and Child, Detail: Detail: Thomas Aquinas.
- 77.Simone Martini. Altarpiece Polyptych from Santa Caterina, Pisa, 1319-20. 195 x 340 cm. Museo Nazionale di San Matteo, Pisa.
- 78.Simone Martini. Altarpiece Polyptych, Detail: Predella Man of Sorrows with Mary and John.
- 79.Lippo Vanni, attributed. Triptych of the Madonna and Child with Saints Dominic, Aurea, John the Baptist, A Warrior, a Cardinal, and an Apostle, 1350s. 49.2 x 45.6 cm with frame. Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.
- 80.Duccio. Triptych of the Madonna and Child with Saints Dominic and Aurea, c. 1300. Central Panel with frame 61.5 x 39 cm. National Gallery, London.
- 81.Antonio Tempesta. Map of Rome, 1593, Detail: S. Aurea (labelled T. Spiritus Santi). Overall Dimensions 109 x 254 cm.
- 82.Unknown Florentine(?). Two Lid Figures from a Pair of Cassoni, Mid-Quattrocento. Dimensions and present whereabouts unknown.
- 83.Giovanni di Paolo. Illuminations for Dante's Commedia, Paradiso, Canto XXXII: Mary's Mystic Rose. 9 x 20 cm. British Library, London.
- 84.Paolo di Giovanni Fei. Madonna and Child with Eight Saints and Nine Angels; in the spandrels the Annunciation. 86.9 x 59 cm. Lehman Collection, Metropolitan Museum, New York.

85.Circle of Paolo di Giovanni Fei. Madonna and Child with Four Saints and Two Angels, and Eve with Cain and Abel. 46 x 20 cm. Present whereabouts uncertain.

86.Paolo di Giovanni Fei, Workshop. Tree of Life Triptych. Centre panel 59 x 23 cm. Niedersächsisches Landesgalerie, Hannover.

87.Niccolò di Buonaccorso, attributed. Madonna and Child with the Four Evangelists and Six Angels. 52 x 24.1 cm. Present whereabouts unknown.

88.Angelo Puccinelli. Virgin and Child with Eight Saints and Six Angels; in the gable, the Crucifixion. 98 x 53 cm with frame. Lindenau-Museum, Altenburg.

89.Giuliano di Simone. Madonna and Child with Four Saints and Four Angels; in the gable, the Crucifixion. 95 x 78 cm. Galleria Nazionale, Parma.

90.Giuliano di Simone. Fragment of a Madonna and Child with Four Saints and Four Musician Angels. Painted surface 45. 5 x 57.5 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.

91.Giuliano di Simone. Madonna and Child with Four Saints. Dimensions and present location unknown.

92.Master of the Straus Madonna. Madonna lactans with Four Saints and Two Angels. 52.4 x 41.3 cm. Astley-Cheetham Gallery, Stalybridge.

93.Paolo Schiavo. Tabernacle with Madonna and Child Relief, c. 1440-45. Frame 36.2 x 17.8 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

94.Lorenzo Ghiberti. Eve from the Gates of Paradise. Cast 1430s. Gilded bronze. Baptistery, Florence.

Map 1. Central Italy, scale 1: 800 000.

Map 2. Tuscany and Umbria, scale 1: 300 000.

INTRODUCTION

QUESTIONS AND GOALS

As flowers turn toward the sun, by dint of a secret heliotropism the past strives to turn toward that sun which is rising in the sky of history....For every image of the past that is not recognized by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably.

-Walter Benjamin¹

In the Cleveland Museum of Art there is a rectangular panel known as The Madonna of Humility with the Temptation of Eve, dated to around 1400, and attributed to the Marchigian artist Carlo da Camerino (fig. 1). It is a large work, measuring 191.2 x 98.7 cm including its attached frame; this is original except at the bottom, where the panel has been cut down.²

For modern viewers, the imagery of this panel may be surprising. Mary is represented seated on a cushion, cradling the Christ Child in her lap; he is nursing from a breast which emerges from the region of her collarbone, and both figures twist their heads to stare out at the viewer. The Virgin is richly attired in a red dress with gold trim at the cuffs; over this is a blue robe, which both suggests and obscures her figure by its dazzling gold striations and trim. A transparent veil covers her blond hair, and she has a halo of twelve stars, each with a tiny relief bust of a man within it; all of them look toward her except one, who looks away toward the Archangel Gabriel, floating at Mary's side in the traditional kneeling pose of the Annunciation (figs. 2, 4). Above Gabriel's head is a small sun, with a face in gesso relief visible in it, and at

¹Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History" Illuminations: Essays and Reflections, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York, 1969) 253-264, 255.

²European Paintings Before 1500: Catalogue of Paintings Part I (Cleveland, 1974) 59-61. Bibliography for the work can be found in Chapter III of this thesis, where it is discussed in greater depth.

Mary's feet is what appears to be a brown sickle moon. At her left hand is a figure in red and blue, holding a balance and sword, and directly below him is another saint in a pink overdress with yellow sleeves and a blue undergarment, holding a sword and a large shield with a cross on it (figs. 3, 5). Below this is another shield, presumably that of the patron, with a small gold star above a wing on a red background.

This proliferation of pattern and detail is odd enough. But the real shock lies in the lower part of the panel, where Eve reclines at Mary and Christ's feet in a narrow green space in which the shadowy forms of trees and plants are just visible. Eve is isolated from the Virgin and Child by an ornate relief, much retouched, along the edge of their dais, but at the left of the panel, and at the top right, slim wedges of green meet the gold horizon, making it clear the figures do in fact occupy a continuous space. Eve is shown with forbidden fruit in hand and with a female-headed serpent emerging from between her legs; she is also quite naked except for a bit of fur around her hips and thighs, and her carefully modeled breast and limbs are stark against the now-darkened background.

Part of the difficulty of the work may be that its underlying theme is not familiar: Mary can be called the Second Eve, because in assenting to Christ's birth at the Annunciation she helped him to redeem humankind, damned by the Fall in Paradise. This is in fact one of the oldest and most central themes of Marian piety, and it is often invoked in images of the Virgin. Yet the panel may seem more, not less, surprising to viewers familiar with other Quattrocento works based on the same idea. In the 1430s, for instance, Fra Angelico painted three different altarpieces, for the Dominicans of Fiesole and Cortona, and the Servites of Brescia, in which Adam and Eve, demurely

covered, are escorted from Eden just outside the loggia of the Annunciation (fig. 6); a similar composition was used around 1445 in a predella panel by the Sienese painter Giovanni di Paolo.³ In all of these panels, the Expulsion is a relatively small episode at the upper left of the image, farthest from the frontal plane; it is rendered in more subdued colours as well, especially in the Cortona work. While the underlying theological point is the same, these later works offer a clearer indication of each figure's relative importance by size and placement; narrative cause and effect are suggested by a left-to-right reading and careful compositional subordination, rather than by a bald superposition against the frontal plane. Although these works were painted perhaps only thirty years later, they are a world away in conception, and the question, therefore, is not so much why Mary and Eve were juxtaposed in the Cleveland panel, as why their pairing might have taken this particular form.

This form is the main difficulty of the work, for to a modern, post-Freudian viewer, it has definite sexual undertones: the snake on the tree of evil rises suggestively between Eve's bare thighs, and the shape of the forbidden fruit conspicuously echoes the form of both her naked breast and the snake's blond head. In her pink and white nakedness, disposed for the viewer's gaze, in her extreme proximity to Virgin and Child and to the viewer beyond the image surface, Eve's presence is unsettling and even unwelcome;

³The Angelico paintings were done for S. Domenico in Fiesole, c.1429-30 (now Madrid, Prado); S. Domenico, Cortona, c. 1432-34 (now Cortona, Museo Diocesano), and probably S. Alessandro, Brescia (now Museo, San Giovanni Val d'Arno); there is a similar altarpiece in S. Martino a Mensola by an artist working in Angelico's style. See: William Hood, Fra Angelico at San Marco (New Haven and London, 1993) 100-102 and 260-272; and John Pope-Hennessy, Fra Angelico (London, 1974) 192-194, who however disagrees on the Prado and S. Giovanni Val d'Arno attributions to Angelico. For the Giovanni di Paolo predella panel: Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings, 2 vols. (Washington, DC, 1979) I, 223-224.

she may even be reminiscent of the femme fatale of modern film and advertising, invoked in a recent campaign selling vodka, for instance (fig. 7). And at some point, someone has expressed his or her disapproval, for although the panel is generally in very good condition, it has been subjected to systematic vandalism: Eve's wrist, legs, face, and breasts are marked by a series of gashes, and the nursing Child's mouth, Gabriel's face, and the patron's coat of arms have all been similarly attacked. Significantly, modern writers usually interpret such vandalism as a "disempowering" of an image seen as threatening or inappropriate.⁴

Although it is impossible to know when the panel was defaced or why, its unknown vandal's disquiet is at least partly understandable. This was after all an object, like the Fra Angelico panels, whose role was to further devotion, large enough and lavish enough that it must have been for public and shared worship. Presumably it was expected to fulfill the three canonical functions of religious imagery established at least since the papacy of Gregory the Great: to narrate scripture clearly, to arouse appropriate feeling about the subject matter, and to impress it on memory, especially for those who could not read the relevant written sources.⁵ In these generic considerations lies much of our modern unease: the reasonable expectation is that both image and iconography should be fitting for the church setting and the sacred role of the altar in the liturgy, and it may be difficult to imagine that this blatantly stereotyped image

⁴Michael Camille, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge, 1989) 18-19; David Freedberg, *Iconoclasts and their Motives* (Maarssen, 1985).

⁵For this traditional defense of images: L.G. Duggan, "Was Art Really the Book of the Illiterate?" *Word and Image* 5 (1989) 227-251; and for its implications: Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford and New York, 1988), especially 40-56.

was ever perceived as appropriate by a Christian congregation.⁶

Yet the Cleveland panel is only one of almost twenty surviving paintings created in Central Italy between about 1335 and 1445 where Eve is represented lying at the feet of the Virgin and Child in this way. None of these works is especially well known: the earliest and most famous is probably a fresco in the former Cistercian abbey of San Galgano, near Siena, attributed to the workshop of Ambrogio Lorenzetti (fig. 12), but most are relatively small panels attributed to painters from provincial schools, such as Angelo Puccinelli of Lucca (fig. 88), the Master of the *Dormitio* of Terni (fig. 48), or Carlo da Camerino himself, for that matter. The works range from a tiny domestic tabernacle, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 93), to a huge fresco once found over the high altar of S. Gregorio Maggiore in Spoleto (fig. 48); and they occur in a wide range of settings, including the Cistercian monastery of S. Galgano (fig. 12), a Dominican nunnery (fig. 68), and in Franciscan (fig. 67), Augustinian (fig. 37), and Regular Canons' churches (fig. 48). This is a modest but significant number of images, and suggests that despite any modern misgivings, the Mary/Eve composition was meaningful and attractive for a small but important group of Trecento and early Quattrocento patrons, a supposition borne out by the Cleveland panel itself: the beauty and lavishness of the work, and its prominent coat of arms,

⁶Thus for instance Staale Sinding-Larsen, Iconography and Ritual: A Study of Analytical Perspectives (Oslo, 1984) 143: "An iconography spatially connected (permanently or by intended use: e.g. an illustrated sacramentary, a Eucharistic chalice) with an altar is thematically related to the functional operation, expressed through liturgy, of the altar. (...) Such an iconography expresses, represents or reflects concepts in the liturgy (formally stated in it or Traditionally ascribed to it) in such a manner that the modes of iconographical interrelations between the concepts do not violate or distort the principles according to which the prototype concepts are interrelated in the liturgy formally or in accordance with Traditional interpretations." [Capitalisation in original]. See more generally: Peter Humfrey and Martin Kemp, eds., The Altarpiece in the Renaissance (Cambridge, 1990).

underline that the donors were anxious their patronage be known and remembered.

This thesis starts from this apparent paradox, and from the gap it suggests between our modern conceptions of gender and religious imagery, and a possible Trecento understanding of the topic. It seeks plausible suggestions for how these images might have functioned in their original contexts, and of how the juxtaposition of Mary and Eve, so over-determined to modern eyes, might have been understood and received by those who commissioned and who worshipped before these paintings. As such, it is intended to address the increasing need for a close study of imagery of Mary and Eve as it existed in a particular context and form, for in recent scholarship concerned with gender in history, the two women are commonly, even routinely, taken as the defining figures for women in traditional Christian society, often with little explicit historical analysis or justification.

More than thirty years ago, when Ernst Guldán published his iconographic survey Eva und Maria, he identified many of the paintings under consideration, but devoted only ten pages to them.⁷ Since then, however, interest has exploded in the two figures as defining feminine stereotypes: countless books on the later Middle Ages and early Renaissance contain whole chapters titled "Mary or Eve" or "The Second Eve;" a recent exhibition of quite varied female figures in prints was called Eva/Ave (the angel Gabriel's greeting to Mary at the Annunciation), and a recent survey of medieval images of women contrasts the pair from the very first page.⁸ There have also been

⁷Ernst Guldán, Eva und Maria: Eine Antithese als Bildsmotiv (Graz-Cologne, 1966) 128-135 and 215-218; he called them "Lorenzetti-Typ" and argued they arose from a single lost prototype.

new readings of Genesis, analyses of Eve as "Other" in Western history and culture, and discussions of Mary as an ultimately "disempowering" model for women.⁹ Even dissenting voices declare themselves in these terms, as is suggested by a recent book, Né Eva né Maria, or a recent doctoral dissertation on "The Eve/Mary Myth" in medieval French literature.¹⁰ The debate may seem to have a new urgency, in fact, when a female Anglican priest can receive a death threat beginning with the greeting "Ave," which then calls her the Whore of Babylon, and states that since the time of Eve, women have defiled the earth.¹¹

Given this renewed interest, it is not surprising this group of paintings of Mary and Eve has been rediscovered by art historians, after almost a hundred years of brief mentions in articles devoted to other topics: in the last ten years alone, these paintings have been linked to everything from the

⁸Examples include: Henry Kraus, "Eve and Mary: Conflicting Images of Medieval Women" Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany, eds. Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard (New York, 1982) 78-99; Iris Origo, "Eve or Mary?: The Tuscan Women of the fifteenth century as seen by San Bernardino of Siena" Cornhill Magazine 173/1034 (1962-63) 65-84; the print exhibition: H. Diane Russell with Bernadine Barnes, Eva/Ave: Woman in Renaissance and Baroque Prints (Washington DC: National Gallery of Art, 1990); and the survey: Chiara Frugoni, "The Imagined Woman" A History of Women: Silences of the Middle Ages, ed. Christiane Klapisch-Zuber (Cambridge MA and London, 1992) 336-422.

⁹Mieke Bal, "Sexuality, Sin, and Sorrow: The Emergence of Female Character (A Reading of Genesis 1-3)" The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge MA and London, 1986) 317-338; Monika Leisch-Kiesl, "'Ich bin nicht gut, ich bin nicht böse...': Zur Eva-Maria-Antithese in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit" Maria in der Welt: Marien-verehrung im Kontext des Socialgeschichte 10.-18. Jahrhundert, eds. Claudia Opitz et al. (Zürich, 1993) 123-138; Monika Leisch-Kiesl, Eva als Andere: Eine exemplarische Untersuchung zu Frühchristentum und Mittelalter (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna, 1992); Marina Warner, Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary (London, 1976, 1985).

¹⁰Michela Pereira, Né Eva né Maria: Condizione femminile e immagine della donna nel Medioevo (Bologna, 1981); Karen Jane Taylor, "Redefining the Feminine: The Eve/Mary Myth of Femininity in French medieval literature," Ph.D. diss., University of Georgia, 1990.

¹¹"Death threat to woman priest," The Guardian December 13, 1995, 3.

Immaculate Conception to "la pittura infamante," a rather amazing range.¹² My own work is part of this trend, but seeks to address an issue which has not been sufficiently acknowledged: if we wish to explore the origins of our own society in the images of the past, we need to be specific about both the meanings and mutations of those images, and this must necessarily begin with an investigation of what works such as the Cleveland panel might have meant to those who created them or worshipped before them. And while I am aware of criticisms that any boundaries imposed on attempts to re-create a given context through surviving sources are ultimately arbitrary, since anything can potentially become evidence, it nevertheless seems clear that historical and generic specificity are crucial to such an art historical undertaking, and that evidence can be limited without thereby being negated.¹³

In seeking to examine the particular context and significance of these works, this thesis has a different goal from previous studies of these paintings. In some cases context was simply not an issue: in Eva und Maria, for instance, Guldan was primarily interested in grouping by iconographic similarities, and therefore did not explore the creation or reception of specific examples.¹⁴

¹²Emma Simi Varanelli, "Spiritualità mendicante e iconografia mariana: il contributo dell'ordine agostiniano alla genesi e alle metamorfosi iconologiche della Madonna dell'Umiltà" Arte e spiritualità nell'ordine agostiniano e il convento San Nicola a Tolentino (Tolentino, 1992) 77-99; Marco Grondona, Una città e la sua memoria: Todi nell'invenzione iconografica e nella figura d'un locus celeber (Spoleto, 1991) 172-173. Sometimes the paintings seem to be included only because the writer is taken with the imagery: thus in the most recent publication of the Cleveland panel, it is illustrated without comment: V.A. Kolve, "The Annunciation to Christine: Authorial Empowerment in 'The Book of the City of Ladies'" Iconography at the Crossroads, ed. Brendan Cassidy (Princeton, NJ, 1993) 171-196, figure 15.

¹³For this criticism: Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson, "Semiotics and Art History" AB 73 (1991) 174-208, especially 174-180; and for two studies addressing the problem of evidence: Martin Kemp, "The Taking and Use of Evidence; with a Botticellian Case Study" Art Journal 44 (1984) 207-215, Michael Baxandall, Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures (New Haven and London, 1985).

More problematically, however, these fundamental issues have also been ignored when gender is a concern, as a brief example suggests. Recently the Cleveland panel was given pride of place as the cover illustration of Margaret R. Miles's Carnal Knowing: Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West, and shown again in a chapter called "The Female Body as Figure." Miles sums up her thesis in her discussion of the work:

figures of the ideal woman - like the Virgin- played as important a role in shaping real women's subjectivity and socialization as negative female images that formulated what women must avoid. Together, 'positive' and negative figures defined the range of acceptable appearance, attitudes, and behavior prescribed for women. In the Italian altarpiece The Madonna of Humility with the Temptation of Eve, for example, images of the "good woman" and the "evil woman" are juxtaposed in the same field.(...) Female good and female evil are clearly identified in these contrasted figures. Despite her monumental bulk, Mary is disembodied, placed in a heavenly setting, with only enough body to protect and nourish the infant Child. Eve, on the other hand, *is* body.(...) Her naked body - her realistic breast, so different from the Virgin's breast above, her flowing, wavy hair and shapely thigh - signals her sinfulness, just as the Virgin's lack of body reveals her goodness.¹⁵

Although Miles immediately contradicts herself by adding: "It is impossible to identify with precision the social effect on historical women of representations of the female body as literary figure and artistic device," the panel is still seen as actively shaping its unknown viewers' perceptions in a

¹⁴Apart from Guldan, other iconographic studies include: Sigrid Esche, Adam und Eva: Sündenfall und Erlösung (Dusseldorf, 1957); Oswald Goetz, Der Feigenbaum in der religiösen Kunst des Abendlandes (Berlin, 1965); J. de Mahuet, "Le thème de Marie Nouvelle Eve dans l'iconographie chrétienne" Bulletin de la Société Française d'Etudes Mariales 14 (1956) 27-48; Lutz Röhrich, Adam und Eva: Das erste Menschenpaar in Volkskunst und Volksdichtung (Stuttgart, 1968); Gertrud Schiller, Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst, Band 4, 2: Maria (Gutersloh, 1980); Karin Kryger et al., eds., Kvindebilleder: Eva, Maria og andre kvindemotiver i middelalderen (Copenhagen, 1989).

¹⁵Margaret R. Miles, Carnal Knowing: Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West (Boston, 1989) 139-141.

manner she does not really define.

I would argue such an analysis suffers from a common assumption, that the interpretation of any given image is constant throughout history and therefore does not need to be situated in a particular place and time. Thus Miles ignores the context of devotion and worship in which images like the Cleveland panel functioned, as well as contemporary precedents for its imagery.¹⁶ The surface seduces: the fact that what is represented is "realist" in a very mitigated sense is enough to quell many doubts.¹⁷ Such assumptions about iconography and composition are wide-spread about this group of images of Mary with Eve: thus when discussing the S. Galgano Eve (figs. 12, 27), one writer claims her posture and white dress indicate her redemption,

¹⁶This is perhaps an example of what Diane Owen Hughes has called "isomorphic reflection," the tendency to posit art as a transparent gauge of social concerns, based on an unmediated relationship between images and the ill-defined social forces that produced them: Diane Owen Hughes, "Representing the Family: Portraits and Purposes in Early Modern Italy" Art and History: Images and Their Meaning, eds. Robert I. Rotberg and Theodore K. Rabb (Cambridge, 1986) 7-38, 9. This is a weakness of another study discussing sex and gender using the Cleveland panel: Leo Steinberg, The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and in Modern Oblivion (New York, 1983). Here it is included in an extensive excursus, "The Signal at the Breast," where Steinberg argues the Child calls attention to his need for human food; the panel thus serves Steinberg's larger thesis of a long visual tradition stressing Christ's assumption of all aspects of human existence, including hunger and sexuality. Steinberg has been fairly criticised for assuming the Infant's penis was a straight-forward marker of his sexuality above all else, in 1380 as in 1980: Caroline Walker Bynum, "The Body of Christ in the Later Middle Ages: A Reply to Leo Steinberg" Fragmentation and Redemption (New York, 1991) 79-117. Yet his comment about this particular painting is interesting nonetheless.

¹⁷Part of the difficulty, perhaps, is that in Miles's work, as in other studies of gender in art history, tools of analysis developed initially for nineteenth-century, realist, modernist painting are grafted onto a traditional iconographical approach. Many fundamental feminist studies on art, such as Linda Nochlin's "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists" Art and Sexual Politics, eds. Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker (New York, 1973) 1-39 (first published in Art News 69 (1971)); or Griselda Pollock's Vision and Difference: Feminism, Femininity and Histories of Art (London, 1988), grew from the modernist studies of social art history and addressed nineteenth- and twentieth-century art. When later writers studied pre-modern imagery, they often seemed to start from the same assumptions; Miles, for instance, seems to consider Trecento religious imagery subject to the same principles as realist images, and does not sufficiently acknowledge the fundamental role of devotion in shaping interpretation.

while another speaks of the same figure as "a stunning but dangerous creature," in a too-tight dress "which pulls seductively across her legs and chest," without considering whether she appeared siren-like to her fourteenth-century viewers, notably the celibate monks who officiated in the chapel where she lay.¹⁸

Yet preliminary comparisons with related Trecento images place such interpretations in question, or at least suggest the need for further research. It seems clear, for instance, that Trecento painters were not consistent about pre- and post-lapsarian dress and nudity, and that nakedness, even female nakedness, cannot automatically have been a sign of evil. Both in single images and cycles, Adam and Eve in Eden are normally shown naked and unashamed before God the Father, in accordance with the biblical description: examples include cycles by the Roman Jacopo Torriti in the Upper Church at Assisi in the later Duecento, by the Paduan Guariento in the Reggia Chapel, Padua, probably around 1350, by the Florentine Niccolò di Tommaso in the Convento del Tau in Pistoia, 1372 (fig. 8), and by the Orvietan Piero di Puccio in the Pisa Camposanto between 1389 and 1391.¹⁹ But the first parents could also be shown naked after the Fall, as Niccolò di Tommaso pictured them in

¹⁸Goetz 106-107; Bruce Cole, Sienese Painting from its Origins to the Fifteenth Century (New York, 1980) 171.

¹⁹Guiglielmo Matthiae, Pitture Romana del Medioevo, 2 vols, ed. Maria Andalero (Rome, 1988) II, 201-205; Francesca Flores d'Arcais, Guariento (Venice, 1980) 67-70; Enzo Carli, Gli affreschi del Tau a Pistoia (Florence, 1977); Camposanto monumentale di Pisa: Affreschi e sinopie (Pisa, 1960) 103-110. The Tau paintings were also described by Richard Offner, Studies in Florentine Painting: The Fourteenth Century (New York, 1927, reprint 1972) 110, whose words are revealing: "In the next compartment, Eve, firm-breasted and languorous, pauses at her shuttle and looks yearningly towards Adam;" The Fall is described: "Standing like Aphrodite before the dazed Paris in fifteenth century representations of The Award of the Golden Apple, Eve seems to have risen from the earth, on tall and slender limbs, chastened in shape like a Greek jar, and displays the miracle of her pearl tinted body as she offers it in the symbolic apple."

them in the same cycle at Pistoia (fig. 9); in the Fra Angelico altarpiece from Cortona mentioned above (fig. 6), the first parents are expelled from Eden clothed, but they are naked in Giovanni di Paolo's predella. This flexibility was reflected in other media: in Trecento mystery plays Adam and Eve sometimes wore white or rose shifts, similar to the one on the Montesiepi Eve (fig. 27) for example, and sometimes they had flesh-toned leather "nudity" costumes instead.²⁰ Nakedness was after all one of their only attributes, but more importantly it was one they shared, to varying degrees, with suffering saints and Christ on the Cross. In these later cases it must have had associations of vulnerability, abjection, or suffering in God's name, and it is therefore difficult to base any conclusions about Eve and Mary's relations on Eve's nudity or lack of it. It is also worth considering that in all of these images Eve corresponds to the ideal feminine type of the period, pink and white, with tapering hands, small high breasts, and long, waving blond hair, a portrayal she shared with virgin saints and martyrs, including Sant'Aurea, stripped to the waist and tortured, on Lippo Vanni's panel with Eve and Mary (fig. 68).²¹

A more unambiguous signal of abjection would seem to be Eve's position lying at Mary's feet. Yet here again, I would argue, there is a need to determine more exactly what this might have meant to Trecento viewers. The

²⁰ Alessandro d'Ancona, *Origini del teatro italiano*, 3 vols. (1891, reprint Rome, 1966) I, 77-78 for the white garment, and 451 for nudity, real or feigned; see also Stella Mary Newton, *Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince* (Woodbridge, 1980) 78, 84 on flesh-coloured leather costumes. Although d'Ancona notes that French plays often used real nudity, Eve still presumably had a leather costume of some kind, as she was invariably played by a young man.

²¹ For this ideal female type, see for instance: E. Rodocanachi, *La femme italienne avant, pendant, et après la Renaissance: Sa vie privée et mondaine, son influence sociale* (Paris, 1922) 89-99. The panel is discussed in Chapter V.

representation of a victor, either standing or enthroned, crushing a defeated rival is a theme that has existed since Antiquity: Eusebius of Cesarea reported the Emperor Constantine had an image in his palace of himself and his sons crushing a dragon at their feet and piercing it with a lance, symbolising the defeat of paganism.²² There are also Gothic sculptures which adopt this composition: the Virgin stands on a dragon in trumeau sculptures from the Ile-de-France (c.1210-1220, now Louvre), Amiens Cathedral (c.1220-1230), and Tarragona Cathedral (1278).²³ In Trecento Italy, the Archangel Michael was often represented trampling the dragon, as in the Mary/Eve panel formerly in Livorno by Giuliano di Simone (c.1380-90s, fig. 91), while between the 1360s and 1380s the Florentine Giovanni del Biondo produced panels of John the Evangelist crushing Pride, Avarice, and Vainglory, of Zenobius crushing Pride and Cruelty, and of John the Baptist trampling Herod.²⁴ It might be objected that Eve is not trampled by Mary in any of these images, precluding the comparison, but in the scholastic triumphs of the various mendicant orders, defeated heretics are shown either sitting dejectedly or lying with more or less

²²Marie-Louise Thérél, Le Triomphe de La Vierge-Eglise: A l'origine du décor du portail occidental de Nôtre-Dame de Senlis; Sources historiques, littéraires et iconographiques (Paris, 1984) 162.

²³Guldan 214-215. It is interesting that from the fourteenth century, Mary was occasionally shown standing on Eve either in a socle or directly, as at Paris (1330), St-Laud (first half of 14th century), and much later at Cologne (1520-1525): see Guldan 203-206.

²⁴For the Giovanni del Biondo images: Millard Meiss, Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death (Princeton, NJ, 1951), 49-53, who argues this type of imagery is related to the increasing tendency toward symbolism in later Trecento painting, and that only from the 1360s and 1370s are human figures rather than attributes shown being trampled. Such a conclusion would be a tempting explanation for Eve's more dignified position, but there are in fact earlier examples of trampled human figures: in a Bible of about 1340, now in Malines (fig. 64), the Neapolitan artist Cristoforo Orimina included an image of King Robert of Anjou surrounded by virtues standing on corresponding human vices: Ferdinando Bologna, I Pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli 1266-1414 (Rome, 1969) 276-277.

grace at the feet of the saintly teacher, as Eve lies before Mary. In a panel of about 1335 from the Dominican church of Santa Caterina in Pisa (fig. 10), Thomas Aquinas is enthroned in a mandorla of light, flanked by biblical teachers, Plato, and Aristotle, while Averroes lies dejected at his feet; in a fresco of about 1380 in Sant'Agostino, Montalcino (fig. 11), Augustine is enthroned, surrounded by doctors of the church and flanked by personifications of Philosophy and Religion, while two heretics lie awkwardly at the steps of his throne, holding long scrolls not unlike Eve's own in several of our images.²⁵

In none of these images, however, do the defeated make visual contact with either the saint or the viewer: their positions are isolated and often twisted and awkward, their eyes are cast down, and no other figure in the composition shows any awareness of their presence. More importantly, all of these figures - dragons, vices, and heretics - are recognised and unequivocal enemies of both Christians and their church. Yet there would be little honour in Mary's title of the Second Eve if Eve were the declared enemy of her descendants, and it may therefore be significant that when Eve is placed at Mary's feet, she is never shown trampled, and invariably looks either out toward the viewer or up toward the Virgin and Child. Moreover, two of Eve's direct and most exalted descendants were commonly shown in a similar

²⁵The Triumphs of Saint Thomas include Trecento images in S. Caterina, Pisa, in the Spanish Chapel of Santa Maria Novella, Florence, and in a panel now in the Lehman Collection, New York, and Quattrocento frescoes in S. Domenico, Spoleto, and the Carafa Chapel, S. Maria sopra Minerva, Rome; the Triumphs of Augustine include frescoes in S. Agostino, Montalcino and S. Agostino, Siena, a panel in Ferrara, and a series of Bolognese miniatures. See now: Dorothee Hansen, Das Bild des Ordenslehrers und die Allegorie des Wissens: Ein gemaltes Program der Augustiner (Berlin, 1995); for the Pisa and Montalcino images: Enzo Carli, Pittura Pisana del Trecento, 2 vols. (Milan, 1958) I, 19-42, and Gaudenz Freuler, Bartolo di Fredi Cini: Ein Beitrag zur sienesischen Malerei des 14. Jahrhunderts (Disentis, 1994) 222-259.

position: the Virgin herself, in scenes of the Nativity of Christ, and the Jesse of countless genealogical trees.²⁶ This is important, since there is no clear evidence for the visual source of the composition of Eve lying at Mary's feet; suggestions for the figure of Eve have included everything from early Christian and Byzantine ivories to Etruscan funeral urns, but it is also quite possible that her position reflects these images of her famous descendants.²⁷

What all this suggests is that Mary and Eve's relations may be more nuanced than those of enemy and vanquished, and therefore a close art historical reading of this group of images is necessary for any understanding of how these two figures functioned within Trecento and early Quattrocento piety. The form of this thesis has in fact been determined by the need for specificity about the contexts and audiences of the theme, despite an obvious difficulty: most of the panels under discussion are not documented before the late nineteenth-century. The Cleveland panel (fig. 1) can again be taken as a paradigm: it has no history before its 1883 purchase by the critic and collector James Jackson Jarves.²⁸ And Carlo da Camerino, to whom it was attributed in

²⁶For the first, see for instance: Enrica Neri Lusanna, "Il gruppo ligneo della Natività di San Nicola a Tolentino e la scultura marchigiana" Arte e spiritualità negli ordini mendicanti: gli Agostiniani e il Cappellone di San Nicola a Tolentino (Rome, 1992) 105-124; for the second: Arthur Watson, The Early Iconography of the Tree of Jesse (Oxford, 1934).

²⁷For these suggestions about Eve: Esche 46; Erwin Panofsky, Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art (New York, 1972) 152 nt. 1.

²⁸Cleveland Museum of Art European Paintings Before 1500 59-61. The catalogue Jarves prepared states only "the old masters of this gallery were secured many years ago, when circumstances for their acquisition were more favorable than at present." James Jackson Jarves, Handbook for Visitors to the Hollenden Gallery of Old Masters Exhibited at the Boston Foreign Art Exhibition in 1883-4, collected by James Jackson Jarves and Purchased by L.E. Holden of Cleveland, Ohio (Cleveland, 1884) 3. This was only the first collection Jarves put together; a later one, still known as the Jarves Collection, passed to the Yale University Art Gallery. See: Charles Seymour Jr., Early Italian Paintings in the Yale University Art Gallery (New Haven and London, 1970).

1950, is known only from an inscription on a crucifix signed and dated 1396, while the artistic history of the Marche, where he is presumed to have worked, is poorly documented and relatively unknown.²⁹

Because of these limitations, this thesis will concentrate mainly, though not exclusively, on the frescoes of Mary with Eve, because more information is available about them for analysis of creation and context; Maps I and II show the distribution of these works. The discussion is divided into five chapters, a conclusion, and an appendix. As it is helpful to know how the two figures were linked for Trecento and Quattrocento Christians before one examines the images, the first chapter is an overview of late medieval exegesis and traditions relating Mary and Eve. The next four chapters are case studies, each intended to explore a particular instance of patronage and devotional milieu. The first chapter focuses on what is probably the earliest surviving use of the iconography, in a fresco cycle at the former Cistercian abbey of San Galgano near Siena (c. 1336-42, fig. 12). The second one looks at three images where Mary's queenship is stressed, the Coronations of S. Agostino in Montefalco (1340s, fig. 37), and the Camposanto in Pisa (1390-91, fig. 47), as well as the Cleveland panel itself; the ruined fresco from Spoleto (c. 1390, fig. 48) is also briefly mentioned. This discussion focuses on the varied implications of Mary's rule, especially for the patrons (and artists) of the embattled fourteenth-century Papal States. The third case study particularises some of these themes: it examines the regal 1371 Madonna of Graces in

²⁹The 1950 attribution was made by Federico Zeri, "Archangelo di Cola da Camerino: due tempere" Paragone 1 (1950) 37-38; see Chapter Three for discussion and bibliography. For art in the Marches: Pietro Zampetti, La Pittura nelle Marche, 4 vols. (Florence, 1988-1991); Miklòs Boskovits, Pittura umbra e marchigiana fra Medioevo e Rinascimento (Florence, 1973); Pietro Zampetti, Pittura Marchigiana: da Gentile a Raffaello (Milan, 1971); Giuseppe Vitalini Sacconi, Pittura marchigiana: la scuola camerinese (Trieste, 1968).

Magione, near Perugia (fig. 49), and the knightly devotion of its secular, aristocratic donor. Finally, the last study focuses on the only image securely linked to a female religious community, a large triptych created in 1358 for the church of the Dominican nuns of Sant'Aurea in Rome (fig. 68), by the Sienese artist Lippo Vanni; this painting offers a basis for examining the complicated question of female viewership for images of Mary and Eve. Thus each of these four studies addresses a separate problem, but together they allow a series of wider conclusions to be drawn about these paintings, including some of the smaller panels not discussed in depth in the main text; these conclusions are presented in the final chapter, which is followed by an appendix providing more detailed information about the smaller panels.

CHAPTER ONE

LINKING EVE AND MARY

Among the rules with which the Spirit has sealed the law so as to guard the pathway of light, the seal of recapitulation guards some things with such subtlety that it seems more a continuation than a recapitulation of the narrative.
-Tyconius (fourth century)¹

In 1306, about thirty years before the first image of Mary with Eve at her feet was created, the Dominican Giordano of Pisa preached a cycle of Lenten sermons in Florence. On the feast of the Annunciation, March 25, he began his sermon with the Angel Gabriel's greeting to Mary, "Ave gratia plena," before expanding on the necessity of the Annunciation to Mary and the Incarnation. God, he said:

Non volle per forza vincere il demonio, che non si mostrava incioè potenza, ché tutti gli potrebbe disfare, né colle dignitadi del mondo, per tòrre via ogne errore; ma volle vincere le demonia co la più debile cosa, in tutti i modi debile, che fosse: per femina, non profetessa, debile, povera, umile. Non fece così il demonio, anzi si fece a vincere il castello dell'umana natura al più debile luogo, alla femina, e Idio tutto 'l contrario per spezzarli il capo, cioè al prencipe de' dimonî, il mal prencipe. Onde per lei si ritrovò l'umana natura, come per Eva si perdé.²

In 1426/7, perhaps twenty-five years after most of the paintings in question had been completed, the Franciscan Bernardino of Siena preached his own series of Lenten sermons in his hometown. He too discussed the Annunciation, and he too expounded on the angelic greeting:

¹Tyconius, *The Book of Rules*, trans. William S. Babcock (Atlanta, 1989) 109.

²Giordano da Pisa, *Quaresimale fiorentino 1305-1306*, ed. Carlo Delcorno (Florence, 1974) 353-354.

Che disse l'Angiolo? Disse: Ave. Or rivolta queste lettere, A V E, e mette l'ultima prima, e la prima ultima, e dirà Eva. Che vuol dire Eva? Vuol dire guai e dolore. E Ave che vuol dire? Ab a quod est sine ve, cioè senza dolore e senza alcuna pena; e Eva vuol dire con dolore.³

Bernardino continues: Mary has saved women from the curse placed on Eve and her descendants for disobedience.⁴ More specifically:

Prima dico che madonna Eva fu quella che ci cacciò del paradiso, per la qual cagione noi riceviamo la morte. Su tu dirai: - la donna fu quella che ci fece cadere ne la morte; - dico che tu dici vero, ma pure la donna fu quella che ci rilevò e risuscito. Quell'altro dice: - oh, se tu procurarai, la donna è stato il principio d'ogni male.. - E io ti rispondo: la donna è stata principio di ogni bene. Dice quell'altro: - pur la donna è da meno che non è l'uomo, però che ella è sottoposta a l'uomo per boca di Dio; - e io ti dico che è da più che non è niuno omo. (...)[Per la fragilità] d'Eva poteva essere detto alla donna: -tu sei caduta, senza niuna stabilità; che come tu fusti tentata dal serpente, subito ti gittasti a terra senza niuna resistenza. - Maria riparò anco a questa vilipensione della donna, chè possono dire le donne: - se Eva fu caduta, e Maria fu stabile e ferma.⁵

The sermon then concludes by stressing Mary has saved women the burdens inherited from "lo peccato del nostro primo padre e de la nostra prima madre," and that she has done so "per amore d'Eva."⁶

The wealthier Tuscans who listened to this sermon might have returned home to meditate on what they had heard, perhaps consulting that popular handbook, the Golden Legend of Jacobus of Voragine (c. 1226-1298),

³Bernardino da Siena, Prediche volgari, dette nella piazza del Campo l'anno 1427, ed. Luciano Banchi. 3 vols (Siena, 1880-1888) II, 390.

⁴Bernardino II, 409.

⁵Bernardino II, 410, 413.

⁶Bernardino II, 429.

which existed in fourteenth-century vernacular translations. Turning to the feast of the Annunciation, they would have found the following:

It was fitting that the Annunciation should precede the Incarnation, and this for three reasons. The first is that the order of reparation should correspond to the order of transgression or deviation. Therefore since the devil tempted the woman to lead her to doubt, through doubt to consent, and through consent to sinning, so the angel brought the message to the Virgin by the announcement to prompt her to believing, through believing to consent, and through consent to the conceiving of the Son of God."⁷

In the same work they could find this lengthy citation of John of Damascus for the most important Marian feast, her Assumption into Paradise:

Eve lent her ear to the serpent, drank the poisonous draft, was entrapped by pleasures, subjected to the pangs of childbirth, and condemned with Adam. But [Mary] this truly blessed woman, who bent her ear to God, whom the Holy Spirit filled, who bore the Father's mercy in her womb, who conceived without contact with a husband and gave birth without pain, how shall death swallow her, how shall corruption dare to do anything to the body that bore Life itself?⁸

As these examples already suggest, Mary's role as the Second Eve was one of the fundamental, ubiquitous, and greatest themes of Marian praise, invoked, in fact, in almost any discussion of her cult. The history, development, and implications of this theme are crucial to any understanding of those paintings of Mary with Eve at her feet, and form the subject of the present chapter, which seeks to explore the links between the two women in

⁷Jacobus de Voragine, *Golden Legend*, 2 vols., trans. William Granger Ryan (Princeton, 1993) I, 196; the other two reasons are: "The angel is God's minister and servant, and the Blessed Virgin was chosen to be God's mother; and as it is right for the minister to be at the service of the mistress, so it was fitting that the Annunciation be made to the Blessed Virgin by an angel," and: "The Incarnation made reparation not only for human sin but for the ruin of the fallen angels. Therefore the angels were not to be excluded..."

⁸Jacobus II, 93-94.

textual sources. There have been several studies of this material, and thus the present chapter is limited in scope and synthetic in nature: it will introduce the earliest elaborations of the pairing, before discussing its implications and uses for late-medieval audiences, both the Latin-reading elites who formed Jacobus's original readership, and the wider public who listened to Giordano or Bernardino.⁹

As these sources suggest, these themes can be summarised as follows: Mary's assent at the Annunciation allows Christ's passion, which undoes the curse placed on humanity with Original Sin, especially the certainty of death; Mary therefore undoes Eve's sin, linked to her weakness and frailty, and saves their mutual descendants, the Christian members of the Church. Finally, because she is the advocate of Eve in particular, Mary is the advocate of all Christians who turn to her, but also of women in general.

I. The First Developments

In fact, without perhaps knowing or caring, these medieval Christians were hearing and reading a set pattern of Marian praise already well

⁹ The most exhaustive studies were published in four special editions of the *Bulletin de la Société française d'études mariales* called "La Nouvelle Eve," often with useful appendix listings of sources; see especially: G. Jouassard, "La Nouvelle Eve chez les pères anteniciens" 12 (1954) 35-54; B. Capelle, "Le thème de la Nouvelle Eve chez les anciens docteurs latins" 12 (1954) 55-76; and H. Barré, "La nouvelle Eve dans la pensée médiévale d'Ambroise Autpert au pseudo-Albert" 14 (1956) 1-26. See also: Hans Martin von Erffa, *Ikonologie der Genesis: Die christlichen Bildthemen aus dem Alten Testament und ihre Quellen*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1989) I, 211-216; Leisch-Kiesel; Guldan; Hilda Graef, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*, vol. 1 of 2 (London and New York, 1963); Hervé Coathale, *Le Parallélisme entre la Sainte Vierge et l'Eglise dans la tradition Latine jusqu'à la fin du XIIe siècle* (Rome, 1954) 11-30, with appendix of sources; and Anselm Salzer, *Die Sinnbilder und Beiworte Mariens in der deutschen Literatur und lateinischen Hymenpoesis der Mittelalters* (Linz, 1893) 476-487. In the present study, writers most relevant for the worshippers of specific images of Mary with Eve, notably the Cistercians of S. Galgano and the Dominicans of S. Aurea, will be treated in the chapter on the image in question.

established by the Council of Ephesus in 431, and therefore at least a thousand years old: by consenting to the Annunciation, Mary redeemed Eve's Fall.¹⁰ And although the specific title "Second Eve" was not used until much later, the explicit linking and contrasting of Mary and Eve was even older, almost as old, in fact, as Christianity itself.¹¹

The raw material was of course provided by the Bible narratives of Genesis 3 and the Life of Christ, especially Luke 1, 26-39.¹² In the first, the devil approached Eve in Paradise, and at his suggestion, both she and Adam ate the forbidden fruit; God then condemned them to death, work, and sorrow, and Eve was told she would be subject to Adam, and would bring forth children in pain; here Adam gave her name, which meant "The Mother of All the Living." In Luke, Mary was approached by the Angel Gabriel, who greeted her with "Ave," and she consented to become the mother of Jesus, Son of the Most High.

These two passages were first brought together, however, in early arguments about Christ's nature, human and divine, and not specifically to honour Mary. The earliest surviving use of the pairing comes within a hundred and fifty years of Christ's death, in Justin Martyr's (ob. c. 165) Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew.¹³ The premise of the work is that Trypho and his companions

¹⁰Graef 112.

¹¹Both Barré 4 and Coathlem 15 note early authors opposed them without using the explicit titles "Second Eve" or "New Eve."

¹²Throughout this thesis, the Bible cited is the Douay Rheims Bible (Baltimore, 1899; reprint Rockford, IL, 1989).

¹³Justin Martyr, "Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo" PG 6, 471-800; for an introduction to the theological debates of this period, and to several writers to be considered here: Richard A. Norris, God and World in Early Christian Theology: A Study in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen (London, 1966). According to Lino Cignelli, Maria nuova Eva nella Patristica greca (secc. II-V) (Assisi, 1966) 31, there may have been an even earlier occurrence of the theme: in his Tractatus de fabrica mundi Victor of Pettau records that Papias of

have asked Justin to explain his conversion to Christianity, and the argument hinges, not surprisingly, on Christ's status as the Messiah. Matching his discourse to his audience, Justin seeks to prove his arguments from Jewish tradition: thus he justifies his belief in New Testament events by showing how they are clearly foretold in the Old Testament, and Adam is mentioned often as the precursor of Christ.¹⁴ But Justin also relies on the miracle of the virgin birth, and here the parallels between Mary and Eve, Annunciation and Fall, serve as evidence that Christ was created God and Man before the beginning of the world, as part of a coherent plan of fall and redemption:

ex Virgine hominem esse factum, ut qua via initium orta a serpente inobedientia accepit, eadem et dissolutionem acciperet. Eva enim cum virgo esset et incorrupta, sermone serpentis concepto, inobedientiam et mortem peperit. Maria autem Virgo, cum fidem et gaudium percepisset, nuntianti angelo Gabrieli laetum nuntium, nempe Spiritum Domini in eam superventurum et virtutem Altissimi ei obumbraturam, ideoque id quod nasceretur ex ea sanctum, esse Filium Dei, repondit: "Fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum."¹⁵

The second use of the theme develops the same idea, in a similar context. This is the Adversus haereses of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyon (ob. 202), where he devotes two long passages to the parallels between Mary and Eve. The first occurs in a discussion about Christ assuming actual human flesh as

Norris, God and World in Early Christian Theology: A Study in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen (London, 1966). According to Lino Cignelli, Maria nuova Eva nella Patristica greca (secc. II-V) (Assisi, 1966) 31, there may have been an even earlier occurrence of the theme: in his Tractatus de fabrica mundi Victor of Pettau records that Papias of Hierapolis had said "Quis itaque lege Dei doctus, quis plenus Spiritu Sancto non respiciat corde, ea die Gabriel angelum Mariae virgini evangelizasse, qua die draco Evam seduxit?"

¹⁴Adam is mentioned PG 6, 671, 686, 699. Justin will use a similar rhetorical strategy with other audiences in other works; Greeks are convinced with references from their mythology, and Latins with Roman tradition. These differing "audiences" should probably be understood as a rhetorical convention, rather than intended readers for his works.

¹⁵Justin Martyr, "Dialogus cum Tryphone" PG 6, 710-711, "Quo sensu Christus Jacob et Israel et Filius hominis."

part of God's plan for redemption;¹⁶ the second, in the fifth and final book, concerns the nature and resurrection of the flesh. Here an entire chapter is devoted to contrasting Eve and Mary, her patroness, and it includes the following rather garbled argument:

Manifeste itaque in sua propria venientem Dominum, et sua propria eum bajulante conditione, quae bajulatur ab ipso, et recapitulationem ejus, quae in ligno fuit inobedientiae, per eam quae in ligno est obedientiam, facientem, et seductionem illam solutam, qua seducta est male illa, quae jam viro destinata erat virgo Eva, per veritatem evangelizata est bene ab angelo jam sub viro Virgo Maria. Quemadmodum enim illa per angeli sermonem seducta est, ut effugeret Deum, praevaricata verbum ejus; ita et haec per angelicum sermonem evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum, obediens ejus verbo. Et si ea inobedierat Deo; sed haec suasa est obedire Deo, uti virginis Evae Virgo Maria fieret advocata. Et quemadmodum astrictum est morti genus humanum per Virginem, salvatur per Virginem: aequae lance disposita, virginalis inobedientia per virginalem obedientiam.¹⁷

Here the pairing is already taking a more properly Marian slant, and if Justin had already argued Mary's Annunciation allowed Eve's sin to be undone, Irenaeus introduces the next development: Mary is therefore Eve's special advocate. Both of these points were made by Giordano and Bernardino more than a millenium later, and from the second conclusion, that Mary is Eve's

¹⁶Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyon, "Contra haereses," PG 7, 1, 433-1118; and PG 7, 2, 1119-1226, 959-960: "Consequenter autem et Maria virgo obediens invenitur, dicens: "Ecce ancilla tua, Domine, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum." Eva vero inobediens: non obedivit enim, adhuc eum esset virgo. Quemadmodum illa virum quidem habens Adam, virgo tamen adhuc existens ...inobediens facta, et sibi, et universo generi humano causa facta est mortis: sic et Maria habens praedestinatum virum, et tamen virgo, obediens, et sibi, et universo generi humano causa facta est salutis. Et propter hoc lex eam, quae desponsata erat viro, licet virgo sit adhuc, uxorem ejus, qui desponsaverat, vocat; eam quae est a Maria in Evam recirculationem significans: quia non aliter quod colligatum est solveretur, nisi ipsae compagines alligationis reflectantur retrosus; ut primae conjunctiones solvanrue per secundas, secundae rursus liberent primas. ...Sic autem et Evae inobedientiae nodus solutionem accepit per obedientiam Mariae. Quo enim alligavit virgo Eva per incredulitatem, hoc virgo Maris solvit per fidem."

¹⁷Irenaeus, "Contra haereses" PG 7, 2, 1175: "Cur Eva inobediente et praevaricatrice comparatur B. Virgo Maria, illius advocata."

advocate, it is only a short step to the idea that Mary is therefore the saviour and model for women and especially virgins, probably introduced by Origen of Alexandria (c. 183-c. 254) in a discussion of Mary's words "My soul magnifies the Lord," spoken to her cousin Elizabeth, whom she visited immediately after the Annunciation: "Et quomodo peccatum coepit a muliere et deinceps ad virum pervenit, sic et principium salutis a mulieribus habuit exordium, ut ceterae quoque mulieres, sexus fragilitate deposita, imitarentur vitam conversationemque sanctarum earumque vel maxime."¹⁸ The Church Father Jerome (c. 345-c. 420) would phrase this "haec Virgo perpetua multarum est mater virginum," embroidering on it in a letter addressed to a young woman about preserving virginity, the most perfect state; he first explains that after the Fall, Eve bore children in sorrow, and continues:

Postquam vero Virgo concepit in utero, et peperit nobis puerum, "cujus principatus in humeros ejus", Deum, fortem, patrem futuri saeculi, soluta maledictio est. Mors per Evam: vita per Mariam. Ideoque et ditius virginitatis donum fluxit in feminas, quia coepit a femina.¹⁹

Jerome's formulation "Eva-mors/Maria-vita" became a favourite simplification of the theme, widespread in the Middle Ages because of its paraphrase in such texts as the Glossa Ordinaria entry for Luke I, 28 ("And the angel being come in, said unto her: Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women): "Mulier a diabolo seducta mortem intulit: contra mulier ab angelo edocta salutem edidit."²⁰

¹⁸Origen, "Homilia VIII: Magnificat anima mea Dominum" Origenes Werk: Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und die Lukas-Kommentars, ed. Max Rauer (Leipzig, 1930) 54-61, 54-55.

¹⁹Jerome, "Epistola XXII: Ad Eustochium, Paulae filiam," PL 22 394-425, 408.

²⁰"Walafrid Strabo, monk of Fulda, "'Glossa ordinaria" PL 113 67-1316; and PL 114 9-752, PL 114, 246; for the importance of this work: M.T. Gibson, "The Place of the *Glossa*

All of these passages are in fact modeled on a similar "proof," the pairing of Christ and Adam used in the letters of the apostle Paul. In I Corinthians, 15, Paul is attempting to convince his audience of unbelievers of Christ's status as the Messiah, which assures the resurrection of the body. He writes:

But now Christ is risen from the dead, the firstfruits of them that sleep: For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead. And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive(...) *The first man Adam was made into living soul*; the last Adam into a quickening spirit. (...)The first man was of the earth, earthly: the second man from heaven, heavenly. Therefore as we have borne the image of the earthly, let us bear also the image of the heavenly.²¹

A similar point is made in Romans 5, 12-20: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed to all men, in whom all have sinned...Adam, who is a figure of him who is to come...For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners; so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just."

If in the Bible Christ was the New Adam, so too Mary could be the New Eve, a title justified by the implicit links of the Annunciation story to the narrative of the Fall: as Eve, a woman alone, was approached by a supernatural being, so too was Mary; both listened and then assented to the visitor's will. The similarities are unlikely to be accidental: it has been suggested Luke's recounting of the Annunciation was conceived by its writer as a formal parallel to the earlier story of Eve's temptation in Genesis, 3, in order to reinforce the miraculous nature and the historical truth of the virgin

²¹I Corinthians, 15, verses 21-22, 45-49, 54-57; italics in original.

birth.²² And for Trecento Christians, these ties were reinforced by the so-called Proto-evangelium, Genesis 3, 15, and an accident of the Vulgate translation from the Septuagint. Before condemning Adam and Eve, God cursed the serpent, saying: "And I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; it shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for its heel." But the Vulgate rendered this last passage: "ipsa (not ipse) conteret caput tuum," and not surprisingly this "Ipsa" was normally seen as a clear reference to Mary and her seed, Christ.²³

The Proto-evangelium thus seemed to provide the clearest proof that God had foreseen the Fall and the Incarnation in a great, and retroactive, plan of redemption; it was also an apparently clear and foreordained link between Mary and Eve. This proof was widely known to medieval Christians through such sources as the Biblia Pauperum, which illustrated the Temptation of Eve and the verses of the Proto-evangelium as a type of the Annunciation, explaining that the Genesis prophecy was fulfilled through the Annunciation to Mary.²⁴ So as Adam had called Eve the "Mother of All the Living," Mary could be called the true Mother of all Christians for bearing Christ, who brought the promise of eternal life.²⁵

And as this example also suggests, once the nature of the pairing had been established, the basic themes linking Mary and Eve remained remarkably

²²John A. Phillips, Eve: the History of an Idea (San Francisco, 1984) 132.

²³For a modern interpretation: Stefano M. Manelli, "La 'Donna' del Protovangelo, Genesi 3, 15" Mariologia biblica (Frigento, 1989) 15-30.

²⁴Avril Henry, Biblia Pauperum: A Facsimile and Edition (Aldershot, 1987) 50. The other type is Gideon's fleece, wet with unnatural dew, as Mary became pregnant by the infusion of God's grace.

²⁵Cignelli 61 argues this was originally an Eastern theme, probably introduced by Epifanius, Bishop of Salamina.

constant.²⁶ Thus Mary both undoes and completes Eve's work, in a cycle of sin and redemption underlined by the palindrome "Ave-Eva," Mary is the advocate of women, of virgins, and of course of Eve. Although the specific formulations would vary, more than a millennium later many of these same points were made by the Golden Legend, Giordano, and Bernardino; in this, as in most aspects of Trecento and Quattrocento exegesis and theology, the authority of tradition and the Fathers, the "consensus patrum et doctorum," was paramount, and this was what these Mendicant friars passed on to their readers and listeners.²⁷ And, depending on the models and precedents he used for his work, he might not associate Mary and Eve at all: hence Eve is not mentioned in the Incarnation and Nativity accounts of the Meditationes Vitae Christi; and even Giordano of Pisa, basing himself heavily on the Church Father Augustine of Hippo (354-430), preached an entire cycle on Genesis and mentioned Mary only once, when he remarked, almost in passing, that the Virgin was one possible identification for the woman of the serpent's curse in Genesis 3, 15.²⁸

Between Justin Martyr and Giordano of Pisa, however, a fundamental change had occurred. As mentioned, the original pairing of Mary and Eve came in a Christological context, as part of the debate on His flesh; once that

²⁶Barré 3, speaking of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

²⁷For exegesis in the period: Karlfried Froehlich, "'Always to Keep the Literal Sense in Holy Scripture Means to Kill One's Soul:' the State of Biblical Hermeneutics at the Beginning of the Fifteenth Century" Literary Uses of Typology from the Late Middle Ages to the Present, ed. Earl Miner (Princeton, NJ, 1977) 20-48, especially 38-44; G.R. Evans, The Language and Logic of the Bible: the Road to the Reformation (Cambridge, 1985) 39-68.

²⁸Pseudo-Bonaventura, Meditations on the Life of Christ: An Illustrated Manuscript of the Fourteenth Century, eds. and trans. I. Ragusa and R.B. Green (Princeton, NJ, 1961); Giordano da Pisa, Sul Terzo Capitolo del Genesis, ed. Christina Marchioni (Florence, 1992) 179 mentions the "mulierem," that is "le femine," can be seen as "l'umana natura, anco la Vergine Maria, anco l'altre vergini."

flesh was no longer so much in question, however, the theme could become a more properly Marian praise. It did so quickly in the East, where Mary's cult developed very rapidly.²⁹ But in the West, the theme was discussed relatively little until the late seventh century, when the four major Marian feasts - the Annunciation, Purification, Nativity, and the Dormition - were adopted from the Eastern calendar, encouraging the creation of sermons and liturgies in her honour; from this moment forward, however, Mary's cult would become ever more important, as she became the supreme Mediatrix for humanity with her Son.³⁰ But as Mary ascended, the fundamental nature of the pairing was inevitably affected as well, and this is the next point to be examined.

II. Latin Debates: Recapitulation, Ambivalence, and Contrast

Seeing the New Testament foretold in the events of the Old is of course fundamental to Christianity's conception of history, and this principle was given visual form in its medieval churches. The most important church in the West, Old Saint Peter's, had scenes from Genesis and the Life of Christ running in parallel narratives down its nave, a scheme adopted, especially from the twelfth century onwards, in countless other churches including the Basilica of St. Francis at Assisi or the Collegiate Church of San Gimignano.³¹

²⁹Unfortunately the rich development of the Mary-Eve theme in the Eastern Church cannot be treated here; but see Cignelli, and: T. Camelot, "Marie, la Nouvelle Eve, dans la patristique grecque, du Concile de Nicée à saint Jean Damascene" Bulletin de la Société Française d'Etudes Mariales 12 (1954) 157-172; Marek Starowieyski, "Maria nova Eva in traditione Alexandrina et Antichena (saeculo V) Marianum 34 (1972) 329-385.

³⁰For the Feasts: Martin Jugie, La Mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge (Vatican City, 1944) 195; for the rise of Marian preaching and her role as Mediatrix: Graef 165-166 and 170-171.

³¹Herbert L. Kessler, "L'antica basilica di San Pietro come fonte e ispirazione per la decorazione delle chiese medievali" Fragmenta picta: affreschi e mosaici staccati del medioevo

In the first decades of the Trecento, sculptural programmes such as that of the facade of the Duomo at Orvieto took this to its logical conclusion, representing history - the stories of Genesis, the Prophets, Christ, and the Apocalypse - as first the foretelling and then the acts of Christ, embedded in the fabric of the church itself.³² Events were often linked spatially as well as metaphorically: thus both the Golden Legend and Trecento fresco cycles of the Invention of the True Cross in Volterra and Florence reminded their congregations that Christ had been crucified on the wood of the Tree of Life from Paradise, and that Golgotha was also Adam's tomb.³³ This linking of Christ and Adam, fall, death, and redemption, received its clearest form in the Anastasis, a popular image adopted from the East, where, as an integral part of the Passion, Christ descended into Hell to retrieve his forebears, Adam and Eve first among them.³⁴ These same ideas are in fact brought together in one of the panels juxtaposing Mary and Eve, now in Hannover and attributed to the workshop of Paolo di Giovanni Fei (fig. 86): Christ is crucified on a tree with apostles and evangelists in its branches and with Adam, Eve, Mary, and the Magdalene at its base; Eve's reclining position is obviously based on her

romano (Rome, 1989) 45-64. For Assisi, see Elvio Lunghi, La Basilica di San Francesco di Assisi (Florence, 1996); for S. Gimignano: Freuler 50-95.

³²Julian Gardner, "The façade of the Duomo at Orvieto" De l'Art comme mystagogie: Iconographie du Jugement dernier et des fins dernières à l'époque gothique: Actes du Colloque de la Fondation Hardt, 1994, ed. Yves Christie (Poitiers, 1996) 199-209; Lucio Riccetti, ed., Il duomo di Orvieto (Rome and Bari, 1988); Enzo Carli, Il Duomo di Orvieto (Rome, 1965), and Enzo Carli, Le Sculture del Duomo di Orvieto (Bergamo, 1947).

³³See in general: Rab Hatfield, "The Tree of Life and the Holy Cross: Franciscan Spirituality in the Trecento and the Quattrocento" in Verdon and Henderson, 132-160; for the two cycles: Bruce Cole, Agnolo Gaddi (Oxford, 1977) 21-25 and 79-81; Mariagiulia Burresi et al., Volterra: la Cappella della Croce in S. Francesco (Volterra, 1991).

³⁴Anna D. Kartsonis, Anastasis: The Making of an Image (Princeton, NJ, 1986) and 210-214 for Eve's role in the scene, normally visually less important than Adam's, which Kartsonis interprets as a "condescension" due to Eve's role in Original Sin, "secondary to Adam's." Yet as Eve was especially Mary's responsibility, Adam was Christ's, and such scenes might have been underlining that relation.

use at Mary's feet in other images, and suggests the tree springs directly from her root, but the banner she holds has a traditional reference to Mary, not Christ, with a verse of the Marian hymn Ave maris stella: "Fu(n)da nos in pace, mut(an)s Evae nomen Maria."³⁵

But in its original formulations by the classically-educated Justin Martyr or Irenaeus of Lyon, the underlying principle linking Mary and Eve was more specific than a simple juxtaposition: it relied on either recirculation (mentioned explicitly by Irenaeus, for instance), the reoccurrence of the same basic themes or features in another event, or more specifically on recapitulation, the repetition of a basic theme or event but on a much greater scale and to a greater purpose.³⁶ Recapitulation found its role in medieval Christian exegesis through works such as Tyconius's influential Book of Rules, which sought to establish rules for the interpretation of Christ's message in the Scriptures; this noted recapitulation had a temporal aspect and (in an echo of Paul's words on Adam) that it provided "the likeness of what is to come," either overtly or in a more allegorical manner, so that "it seems more a continuation than a recapitulation of the narrative."³⁷ This rule was enshrined by Augustine, who discussed Tyconius's work in his De doctrina christiana, and concurred that some Biblical narratives seemed to be presented in chronological order, where in fact they referred back to earlier events; to understand the one, it was necessary to understand the other.³⁸

³⁵See Appendix, n. 3 for this panel.

³⁶Barré 3 speaks of recirculatio, while Cignelli 45 prefers recapitulatio, arguably a more exact description for this case. See in general: James J. Murphy, Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance (Berkeley, 1974).

³⁷Tyconius, The Book of Rules, trans. William S. Babcock (Atlanta, 1989) 109, 110.

The Annunciation and the Fall seemed to correspond well to such a rule, especially linked as they were through the Proto-evangelium, but if Eve and Mary, Temptation and Annunciation, were to be linked in this way, the parallels between Eve and Mary needed to be clear: Eve must also have conceived, as Mary had done at the Incarnation, Eve must also have been betrothed but a virgin, and so on. This is the argument made in the Golden Legend, as it had been made by Tertullian in the fourth century:

In virginem enim adhuc Evam irrepserat verbum
aedificatorium mortis; in virginem aeque introducendum erat
Dei Verbum extructorium vitae: ut quod per ejusmodi sexum
abierat in perditionem, per eumdem sexum redigeretur in
salutem. Crediderat Eva serpenti: credidit Maria Gabrieli. Quod
illa credendo deliquit, haec credendo delevit. "Sed Eva nihil
tunc concepit in utero ex diaboli verbo." Imo concepit. Nam
exinde ut abjecta pareret, et in doloribus pareret, verbum
diaboli semen illi fuit. Enixa est denique diabolum
fratricidam.³⁹

This last point is stressed, in fact, by another small Mary-Eve panel (fig. 85), where Mary nurses her Child and Eve appears below with Cain and Abel, holding a scroll with the Genesis 3, 16 curse, "Cum dolore par.," -"in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children."⁴⁰

It will be clear, however, that recapitulation as a structuring principle demands a close congruence between the two related passages in order that their relation may be discerned. It relies on a precise understanding of the events in question, and on a delicate balance: the two elements cannot be pushed too far apart or the similarity will be broken. So when applied to Mary

³⁸Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana, ed. and trans. R.P.H. Green (Oxford, 1995) 188-189. Augustine's work discusses all of Tyconius's rules, and although Tyconius was condemned as a Donatist, his work was extremely influential through Augustine's use of it.

³⁹Tertullian, "De Carne christi" PL 2, 754-791, 782.

⁴⁰See the Appendix, n. 2.

and Eve, there was a potential problem: if Mary's role in redemption was clear, it was also increasingly exalted, while Eve's status and role were inherently, inescapably, ambivalent.

On the one hand, from the earliest adoption of Mary's feasts in the West, the Church tended to stress Mary's presence in heaven and her almost boundless ability and wish to intercede for Christians.⁴¹ Mary slowly became the most powerful intercessory figure, and a whole literature grew up stressing her miraculous interventions on behalf of sinners: no sin was so terrible that Mary could not ensure its pardon, and tales circulated in which even robbing murderers escaped the fires of Hell simply by saying a daily "Hail Mary."⁴² At the same time, her role as the Second Eve was inevitably invoked in hundreds of liturgical and paraliturgical hymns, ensuring a continuing awareness of the theme: among the best known examples, the Ave maris stella celebrates Mary "mutans nomen Evae," "sumans illud Ave," and "Nos emundans a vae," while O gloriosa femina, also still in the Roman liturgy, includes the verse "Quod Eva tristis abstulit/ Tu reddis almo germine;" such figures as Bridget of Sweden (c. 1303-1373) would include these traditional hymns contrasting the two in the Marian office composed for her late-Trecento nuns.⁴³

⁴¹Marie-Louise Thérél, Le Triomphe de La Vierge-Eglise: A l'origine du décor du portail occidental de Nôtre-Dame de Senlis; Sources historiques, littéraires et iconographiques (Paris, 1984) 29.

⁴²For Mary's intercession: Graef 170-171, and Coathalem 62; for her miracles: Mary Vincentine Gripkey, "Mary Legends in Italian Manuscripts in the Major Libraries of Italy" Medieval Studies 14 (1952) 9-47 and 15 (1953) 14-47; for a popular collection: Caesarius of Heisterbach. The Dialogue on Miracles, trans. H. von E. Scott and C.C. Swinton Bland. 2 vols. (London, 1929).

⁴³See: Manuel Garrido Bonaño, "La Virgen Maria en los antifonarios medievales" Scripta de Maria 10 (1987) 43-117; Henri Barré, Prières anciennes de l'Occident à la Mère du Sauveur: des origines à saint Anselme (Paris, 1963), and AHMA passim; Tryggve Lundén, ed., Den heliga Birgitta och den helige Petrus av Skäanninge, Officium parvum beate Marie Virginis 2 vols. (Lund, 1976) I, 44.

At the same time, however, Eve was a more fundamentally troubling figure for her Trecento and Quattrocento descendants. When Bernardino of Siena composed his Lenten sermon, for example, he mentioned the palindrome Ave/Eva, and told his audience that Eva meant "dolore." Another priest or mendicant friar in Bernardino's audience might well have known he was expounding on the etymologies of Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636), which however provided more contradictory information. Predictably, Mary is described in glowing terms: "*illuminatrix, sive stella maris; genuit enim Lumen mundi. Sermones autem Syro Maria Domina nuncupatur, et pulchre, quia Dominum genuit.*"⁴⁴ But Eve is a paradox:

Heva interpretatur *vita*, sive *calamitas*, sive *vae*: *Vita*, quia origo fuit nascendi; *calamitas et vae*, quia per praevaricationem causa exstitit moriendi. A cadendo enim nomen sumpsit calamitas.

Alii autem dicunt ob hoc etiam Hevam vitam et calamitatem appellatam, quia saepe mulier viro causa salutis est, saepe calamitatis, et mortis, quod est vae.⁴⁵

As Isidore's etymologies suggest, Eve's status was deeply ambivalent. On the one hand, as the Mother of All the Living and the direct ancestor of Mary and Christ, she was due a certain honour: thus Dante's *Commedia* and Giusto de' Menabuoi's Baptistry frescoes in Padua both duly included her in the court of Paradise, with Dante placing her among Mary's court of Biblical heroines; similarly, Giotto placed both the first parents immediately at Mary's right hand in his Baroncelli altarpiece, first and most honoured among Mary's attending saints.⁴⁶ She was also the only woman clearly created directly by God,

⁴⁴Isidore, Bishop of Seville, "Etymologiarum" *PL* 82, 9-728, 289.

⁴⁵Isidore, "Etymologiarium" *PL* 82, 275.

⁴⁶Dante, *Paradiso*, 3 vols., ed. and trans. Charles Singleton (Princeton, 1975) I, Canto XXXII; Claudio Bellinati, "Iconografia e teologia negli affreschi del Battistero" *Guisto de' Menabuoi*

explicitly in his divine image, and thus the most beautiful and perfect - at least until she fell.⁴⁷

Yet God must have foreseen the Fall, and the subsequent need for Christ's sacrifice, for the Proto-evangelium suggested a coherent economy of fall and redemption, present from the beginning of human history.⁴⁸ If this were true, however, how much was Eve to be blamed for her actions, and how much should she be praised? One view held the Fall was a necessary evil, or even a "Felix culpa," as it was described in the "Exultet" and in Eastern liturgy; thus one Bible Moralisée of about 1240 illustrated the Annunciation and Adam with the serpent in adjacent roundels, with the explanation: "Hoc significat quod deus permisit diabolo hominem incitari ad peccandum ut hac de causa filium suum mitteret in mundum ut sua passione hominem a morte libaret."⁴⁹ A similar point was made by the head of the Franciscan Order, Bonaventure of Bagnoregio (c. 1217-1274), in his important treatise the Breviloquium: God permitted the serpent to tempt Adam and Eve so that they might fall but then fight on, through their descendants, to eternal salvation, and so that the devil's great power should be clear; ultimately, it was their choice to fall, but God had known they would, and planned accordingly.⁵⁰

nel Battistero di Padova, ed. Anna Maria Spiazzi (Trieste, 1989) 41-82; Monika Cämmerer, "Giotto's Polyptychon in der Baroncelli-Kapelle von Santa Croce: Nachträge und neue Beobachtungen" MKIF 29 (1995) 374-393.

⁴⁷See for instance: Giovanni Boccaccio, "De mulieribus claris" Opere, 12 vols., ed. Vittore Branca (Verona, 1967) X, 29-30.

⁴⁸For a learned Quattrocento disposition of this problem: Jacomo delle Marche, Sermones Dominicales, 3 vols., ed. Renato Lioi (Falconara Marittima, 1978) I, 362-409: "Sermo 22: De predestinatione."

⁴⁹Bodleian ms 270b, fol. 208r; Guldán 174-175 discusses it and the "felix culpa" tradition; see also von Erffa 213.

⁵⁰Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, The Breviloquium, trans. José de Vinck (Paterson, NJ, 1963) 112-114.

Even the precise cause of the Fall was somewhat open to interpretation: both Justin Martyr and Irenaeus of Lyons described its cause as disobedience, but a fourteenth-century preacher's handbook also mentioned it in passing under Envy (the devil was envious of Adam and Eve), Sloth, Gluttony, and Lechery, albeit of a visual kind: Eve would not have touched the tree if she had not looked at it first without due reserve and caution.⁵¹

To the Middle Ages, however, it was clear Original Sin was a mortal inheritance which fell to Eve's descendants. This idea was formulated by Augustine, who argued, against the view then prevailing, that the sin of the first parents was handed down to their descendants in every shameful act of generation, passing death through sin; Eve's Genesis curse, to bear children in pain, was used to support this interpretation.⁵² Sin had now become the enduring human condition, constantly in need of pardon, and there was an unending need for Mary's mercy and intercession.

So by the later Middle Ages, the delicate balance between Mary and Eve was shifting with Mary's increasing power, especially since Eve was an ambivalent ancestress for her illustrious daughter. For the Latin clergy, the most common solution to this problem was to degrade Eve to further stress

⁵¹Siegfried Wenzel, ed. and trans., Fasciculus Morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher's Handbook (University Park and London, 1989) 213-215, 434-435, 606-607, 630-631, 664-665, and 684-685. This is Franciscan, but English, not Italian.

⁵²Elaine Pagels, Adam, Eve, and the Serpent (New York, 1988); she argues this was fundamentally an attempt to justify the institutional role of the Church in the lives of everyday Christians, for only baptism into the Church could cleanse a child of original sin. And the only passage in his work De Gratia Christi et de peccato originali which mentions Mary and Eve does in fact concern baptism: Sic itaque in damnatione hominem prima nativitas tenet, unde nisi secunda non liberat. Tenet ergo diabolus, liberat Christus: tenet deceptor Evae, liberat Filius Mariae; tenet qui per conjugem venit ad virum, liberat qui de conjugate natus est, quae non pertulit virum: tenet qui causam libidinis intulit feminae, liberat qui sine libidine est conceptus in femina: Augustine, "De gratia Christi et de peccato originali. Contra Pelagium et Coelestium" PL 44, 385-410, 407.

Mary's supremacy, as for example in Pope Innocent III's 1216 sermon on the Assumption, which contained a long and flourishing list of oppositions:

Oportebat enim, ut sicut per feminam mors intravit in orbem; ita per feminam vita rediret in orbem. Et ideo quod damnavit Eva, salvavit Maria, ut unde mors oriebatur, inde vita resurgeret. Illa consensit diabolo, et vetitum pomum comedit....ista credidit angelo, et filium promissum concepit...Illa comedit pomum ad mortem(...); ista concepit filium ad salutem (...). Illa peperit in dolore(...); ista generavit in gaudio(...). Illa fuit de solo viro producta, quoniam aedificavit Dominus Deus costam, quam tulerat de Adam in mulierem, sed produxit virum et feminam, haec autem produxit....Illa fuit sine culpa producta, sed produxit in culpam; haec autem fuit in culpa producta, sed sine culpa produxit. Illa dicta est Eva, huic dictum est, Ave; quia per hanc mutatum est nomen Evae. "Ave, inquit, gratia plena, Dominus tecum." Quasi diceret: Illa fuit plena peccato, sed tu "plena gratia." Illa fuit maledicta in mulieribus, sed "benedicta tu in mulieribus." Fructus ventris illius fuit maledictus Cain, sed fructus ventris tui erit benedictus Jesus. Cain invidiose fratrem occidit Abel; sed Jesus invidiose fuit occisus a fratribus.⁵³

As Mary ascends, Eve must be degraded to allow Mary to be further exalted; while such a passage undoubtedly is carefully based on what its writer (and his restricted audience) might consider patristic precedents, the distance between the two women has greatly increased, and they have become almost utter opposites.⁵⁴ Innocent's treatment finds an echo in countless other texts of the

⁵³Innocent III, "Sermo XXVIII: In Assumptione B. Mariae" PL 217, 581-586, 581-582; I have omitted the long quotations from the Bible.

⁵⁴Barré 3-5 discusses Innocent, but his conclusion is slightly different from mine: Barré 3 uses Innocent as an example of how recirculatio was apparently less and less understood, while I would suggest that Innocent's distortion of the bond was an almost inevitable response to Mary's increasingly disproportionate power. It is also true, of course, that Innocent's rhetorical pyrotechnics are modeled on earlier "patristic" tropes, such as those of a sermon ascribed to Saint Ambrose, "Sermo XLV: De primo Adam et secundo," PL 17 715-716 which includes similar lists of oppositions between Mary and Eve, although it is considerably more interesting: "Ergo malum per feminam, imo per feminam bonum; quia per Evam cecidimus, per Mariam stamus: per Evam prostrati, erecti per Mariam: per Evam servituti addicti, per Mariam liberi effecti. Eva nobis sustulit diuturnitatem, Maria nobis reddidit perpetuitatem: Eva nos damnari fecit per arboris pomum, Maria absolvit per arboris donum; quia et Christus in ligno pependit,

period, including that great compilation and distillation of Marian theology, Conrad of Saxony's Speculum Beatae Mariae Virginis, where Eva is the "infedelissima mediatrix perditionis," and the "filia fatua per quem deminorata est dignitas humana," and these examples could be multiplied.⁵⁵

Another learned solution, though less common, was to allegorise both figures, especially Eve, and thus she is sometimes presented as a figure of the flesh, the senses, or the lower intellect; these are tempted by the devil, and made subject to Adam, as spirit or intellect after the Fall.⁵⁶ For as a woman, Eve must necessarily have been weaker than Adam, less able to resist the devil's subtle arguments, and perhaps less to be blamed for failing; this argument was made by Bonaventure, and it is echoing in the sermon by Giordano of Pisa which opened this chapter: the devil attacked the castle of human nature "al più debile luogo, alla femina."⁵⁷

Mary's apotheosis, and Eve and Mary's opposition, reached a logical conclusion with the dogma of the Virgin's Immaculate Conception, increasingly supported from the Duecento onward: this argued that not only was Mary spared from Eve's curse to bear children in pain and suffering, she

ut fructus.[...] Ergo felix Eva, per quam data est occasio: imo felix Maria, per quam tributa est curatio: felix Eva, per quam natus est populus; felicior Maria, per quam natus est Christus. Igitur altera melior, imo et gloriosae utraeque, quia non laetificasset Mariam Christus, nisi Evam priorem, de qua nata est ipsa Maria, definisset; nec venisset ad populum, nisi prius illa deliquisset in saeculo. Haec mater humani generis dicitur, illa salutis; Eva nos edocuit, roboravit et Maria. Per Evam crescimus, per Mariam regnamus; per Evam seducti ad terram; per Mariam elevati ad coelum; et ut totum breviter legis patefaciam sacramentum, et duas in unam fuisse, sicuti omnes esse ostendam: in Eva tunc Maria inerat, per Mariam postea revelata est Eva."

⁵⁵Conrad of Saxony, Speculum seu Salutatio Beatae Mariae Virginis ac Sermones Mariani, ed. Petrus de Alcantara Martinez (Grottaferrata, 1975) 304-305 and 510-511.

⁵⁶Barré 2, 18; see also: A Kent Hieatt, "Eve as Reason in a Tradition of Allegorical Interpretation of the Fall" JWCI 43 (1980) 221-226. This theme will be discussed more fully in Chapter Two.

⁵⁷Giordano of Pisa 353-354; Bonaventure (as in nt. 50) 112-140.

was also conceived free of the first mother's other legacy, Original Sin, from the beginning of time.⁵⁸ Paintings of Mary with Eve, including this group where Eve lies at her feet, have often been seen as early illustrations of this slowly growing belief.⁵⁹

At this point, it may be extremely unclear why including Eve at Mary's feet should ever be thought a worthy expression of honour: Mary was already the all-powerful Mediatrix and Eve's status was ambiguous at best. Yet it should be remembered that relatively few Trecento Christians had ready access to Latin diatribes and debates such as Innocent's sermon or even Conrad's *Speculum*. This wider public learned about Mary and Eve at second-hand, through preaching or as members of Marian confraternities, whose rapid growth in the Trecento and Quattrocento encouraged a whole shared vernacular verse and literature praising Mary, often narrative in character.⁶⁰ In these vernacular sources, I would argue, a different solution to the distance and link between Mary and Eve was commonly presented, with at least as much stress on their similarity as on their difference: in these sources, the shared flesh and blood of Adam, Eve, Christ, Mary, and their descendants often brings its own responsibilities. This is the final aspect of the pairing to explore, and one which has important implications for the paintings to be considered.

⁵⁸Simi Varanelli 77-99; Mirella Levi d'Ancona, *The Iconography of the Immaculate Conception in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance* (New York, 1957); Augustin-Marie Lépiciér, *L'Immaculée Conception dans l'Art et l'Iconographie* (Spa, 1956).

⁵⁹Levi d'Ancona 35-36; Lépiciér 46; This theme is developed in Chapter Three.

⁶⁰For these confraternities: Verdon and Henderson 229-441, especially: John Henderson, "Penitence and the Laity in Fifteenth-Century Florence," 229-249, who notes 223 that by the mid-Trecento there were thirty-three confraternities in the city; and James R. Banker, "Death and Christian Charity in the Confraternities of the Upper Tiber Valley," 302-327; more generally: Gilles Meersseman, *Ordo fraternitatis: confraternite e pietà dei laici nel medioevo* (Rome, 1977).

III. The Vernacular Tradition: Patronage, Advocacy and Blood Ties

One of Jacopone of Todi's (1230-1306) many Laude praises the Virgin in a now familiar manner:

ponisti fin 'ennelo nostro lutto
'n lo qual per lo peccato erâmo e 'n pena
de Eva, che mangò lo véto frutto;
restaurata de nostra ruina
Vergine Maria, beata en tutto.⁶¹

Similarly, a Sienese Lauda of about 1325 features the Cross talking to Mary, saying:

a questo officio non ti chiama 'l Padre,
ma 'l tuo filliuol che per segno si pone.
La parte che t'è chiesta tu l'ài data
i mmano d'Eva che t'avea 'spettata;
di lui Adamo attende l'andata
che redemischa su offensione.⁶²

Even in such brief mentions, several things are striking, notably the predestined nature of the Fall and the Incarnation; Eve lies waiting for Mary to save her, in a fundamentally reassuring image of Mary's powers to intercede. Yet almost as noticeable in other laude is a definite stress on flesh and responsibility.

Paul had first called Christ a new Adam when discussing how Christians share both Adam's flesh and death and Christ's flesh and resurrection, and the earliest writers raised Mary and Eve when seeking to prove both Christ's humanity and divinity: her humanity assured His humanity,

⁶¹Jacopone da Todi, Laude, ed. Franco Mancini (Rome and Bari, 1974) Lauda 3, verses 132-138.

⁶²Roberta Manetti, ed., Laudario di Santa Maria della Scala (Florence, 1993) 187: "Ben vorrei pianger, quando mi rimembro."

fully shared with other men and women. This point reflected classical views of conception derived from Aristotle and Galen, in which the child was assumed to derive its flesh from the mother and its "anima" from the father.⁶³ Thus in the Quattrocento an early writer on conception and childbirth explained about the Virgin:

i membri del suo fiolo facti furono dil suo sangue purissimo, il quale voleno philosophi che sia la pasta dil feto, e che, in luoco de la virtù informativa naturale che è nel seme di l'huomo, suplite il Spirito Sancto. E ziò entendete l'anzuolo quando ge disse *Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te*, che in luoco di quello gie sopravene il Spirito Sancto. E quando quella respondete da puo' a l'anzelo *ecce ancilla Domini, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum in pace*, in quello instante fu preparata la pasta, zioè il sangue suo precioso, a ricevere la forma dil corpo humano, et in quello instante l'anima del fiol de Dio fu introducta in tal corpo formato.⁶⁴

Thus while Christ's birth was miraculous because God provided the animating spark to a virgin, it was banal that His flesh should be provided by his mother: all human flesh came from women - and therefore, from Eve, who alone was created from a man.

For most medieval Christians, the nature of Christ's flesh was a matter for meditation and prayer, but not a matter of doubt; if they wondered at its transubstantiation in the Eucharist at Mass, an increasingly important focus of

⁶³Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA, 1990); Giulia Sissa, "Subtle Bodies" *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, 3 vols., eds. Michel Feher et al. (New York, 1989) III, 133-156. The Aristotelian and the Galenic views of conception were actually somewhat contradictory: the former held that the man provided the animating spark through semen and the woman the matter from menstrual blood, while the later argued that both the male and the female provided seeds of some kind. The two views co-existed, with the Aristotelian model slightly more prominent.

⁶⁴Michele Savonarola, *Trattato ginecologico-pediatrico in Volgare: Ad mulieres ferrarienses de regimine pregantium et noviter natorum usque ad septennium*, ed. Luigi Belloni (N.p., 1952) 37.

late medieval piety, few of them questioned its dual nature.⁶⁵ Yet Mary's fleshly link to Christ is repeatedly stressed in Trecento and Quattrocento songs and verses. In one example, Trecento members of the Disciplinati in Assisi sang a long laud which at one point matter-of-factly presented Mary at her son's elbow intervening for sinners at their request. They have first turned to Christ, who is not sympathetic, and so they turn to Mary:

Le poppe e 'l piecto al tuo filglo
mostragli, con quel che 'l lactassti;
le mano e 'l viso tuo vermilglo
e 'l ventre do' che 'l portasti;
per tuo, matre, reverença
si dura ad noi non dia sententia!

Per gli peccaturi canpare,
foste facta voi regina,
perciò vi piaccia de pregare
per la gente si taipina;
che non sia, trista, dannata,
siate per noi, matre, avvocata!

Mary is moved, and turns to her Son:

Tu sai, filglo, veramente
che de me carne prendiste
e per salvare on<n>e gente
en croce tu morire voliste;
e feciste me avvocata,
senpremai ch'io era chiamata.

Christ replies he has never denied Mary when she intercedes to ask his mercy, and the sinners' final judgment comes down to her.⁶⁶ Crucially, however, their shared flesh is assumed to provide the bargaining power, and Mary's exalted position brings a concomittant responsibility for her to intercede.

⁶⁵Miri Rubin, Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture (Cambridge, 1991).

⁶⁶Franco Mancini, ed., Il Laudario "Frondini" dei Disciplinati di Assisi (sec. XIV) (Florence, 1990) "Lauda Iuditij" 201-212, 207-209. The Laud is part of a much longer Assisi Passion cycle, which had an important influence throughout Umbria and elsewhere in the Trecento.

A similar point is made even more blatantly in verses by the Milanese Umiliati tertiary Bonvesin da la Riva (c.1250-1314): Mary's human flesh makes her responsible for her weak and sinning descendants, allowing her to understand and commiserate. But there is a further consequence: the Virgin's honour is directly linked to her social and moral responsibility for them:

La Vergen gloriosa,	e 'l so fio oltresi,
La nostra carne e 'l sangue	sí ha portao da qui:
Nostra parent è donca,	ni altrament pò di,
Ni se'n porrav lavar	con quant porrav pur fi.

Adonca 'l parentadhego	k'è dentre nu e lé
Ne dé zovar grandemente	in quelle cort de ce,
Adonca ella è tenudha	aprov l'altimiso De
D'aiar zascun del mondo	ke's vol tornar a lé. ⁶⁷

Arguably, these Christians were picturing the Virgin's relations to them according to the rules that governed social ties to their own kin, friends, and patrons, their "parenti, vicini" and "amici," whose constantly changing mutual relations of support and influence were one of the most important features of the era; the expectation of loyalty in return for favours allowed particular individuals to exercise their power.⁶⁸ But such ties also surfaced in sacred settings: both secular and sacred advocacy could be, and were, expressed in the same language, and such associations may have been encouraged because given images belonged to particular families and factions: thus when Trecento Florentines sought and obtained the aid of the rain-making Madonna of Impruneta, they honoured the Virgin's intervention on their behalf, yet the

⁶⁷Gianfranco Contini, ed., *Le opere volgari di Bonvesin da la Riva* (Rome, 1941) "Rationes quare Virgo tenetur diligere peccatores" I, 233.

⁶⁸See for example: Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Kin, Friends, and Neighbours: The Urban Territory of a Merchant Family in 1400" *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Italy*, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Chicago and London, 1985) 68-93; F.W. Kent and Patricia Simons, eds., *Patronage, Art, and Society in Renaissance Italy* (Canberra and Oxford, 1987).

panel also "belonged" to the Buondelmonti, who were also, perhaps, deserving of some thanks.⁶⁹

So if the Virgin really was her petitioners' "carne e sangue," that "parentadhego" meant she was expected to intervene on their behalf. Here the link to Eve, and Eve's ambivalent status, was a potential reassurance, for if Mary had honourably redeemed her First Mother, it might reasonably be assumed she would not forget those who had inherited both Eve's sin and Eve's flesh as a birthright, a legacy they shared with Mary herself, and which she could help them to overcome. Mary's own honour depended, at least partly, on observing these ties of flesh and blood in the appropriate manner, for as the "Peccatore" of another Bonvesin dialogue reminded her:

Se'l peccaor no fosse, Lo so fiöl in terra Ni Crist serav metudho E si lo rex de gloria	De no havrav mandao a fi crucifiaao il to ventre beao de ti no hav ess nao
Adoncha se no fosse Tu no porriss ess matre Per mi donca he't l'onor Ke tu me di'ben esse	lo peccaor colpevre, de De segnor vaievre si grand e si bastevre e dolz e amorevre. (...)
E tu e lo to fio E co la nostra canre Grand amistà è questa, La qual tu di'haver	viviss in carne humana, voi sij in cort soprana. regina permerana, con tuta zent mondana. ⁷⁰

The point could hardly be made any clearer.

⁶⁹Kent and Simons 1-21, especially 1 and 14-15; for Impruneta: Richard Trexler, Public Life in Renaissance Florence (New York, 1980) 63-68; and the same author's "Florentine Religious Experience: The Sacred Image" Studies in the Renaissance 19 (1972) 7-41.

⁷⁰Contini, ed., "De peccatore cum Virgine" I, 48-53, 51-52.

IV. Conclusions

Having explored a variety of textual sources linking Mary and Eve for Trecento and Quattrocento Christians, several general points should be borne in mind as we return to the paintings of Mary with Eve at her feet. In endless sermons, in devotional literature, and in her liturgy, Mary's role as the Second Eve was constantly stressed: in redeeming Eve, Mary had shown herself to be the woman prophesied in Genesis who would crush and defeat the Serpent, delivering Eve's children, all of suffering humanity - and specifically those like Eve, women and virgins - from death to eternal life; thus, for instance, in a Last Judgment of c. 1320-30 in the apse of Santa Maria Maggiore in Tuscania, Mary stands at her Son's right hand, presenting a smaller figure of Eve for his consideration, an indication of her general intercession.⁷¹ And if in learned sources the distance between the two figures was often underlined, this distance could also be a positive sign of Mary's surpassing power; those who composed and sang vernacular *laude*, not excluding the Latin-reading clergy, were presumably confident that Mary would not fail her extended family of Christians, as she had not failed Eve; it was her special responsibility, and the reason for her special honour.

It is now time to explore the implications of these themes for specific images and groups of worshippers, beginning with the earliest surviving pairing of Mary and Eve, created by the Sienese painter Ambrogio Lorenzetti at the Cistercian abbey of S. Galgano, near Siena, where the worshippers in question were almost certainly literate, cloistered, monks.

⁷¹The painting is given to Gregorio and Donato d'Arezzo: Serena Romano, *Eclissi di Roma: Pittura murale a Roma e nel Lazio da Bonifacio VIII a Martino V (1295-1431)* (Rome, 1992) 238-244.

CHAPTER TWO

'ADVOCATA NOSTRA:' THE FRESCOES OF S. GALGANO AT MONTESIEPI

"Mulier in Scriptura aliquando solet poni in mala
significatione, aliquando in bona."
-Aelred of Rievaulx (c. 1109-1153)¹

The first image of the Virgin with Eve to be considered is found in a fresco cycle at the former Cistercian community of San Galgano at Montesiepi, about twenty-five kilometers southwest of Siena (fig. 12; Map I). There are in fact two churches at the site: the great thirteenth-century abbey church, and the twelfth-century Rotunda on the slight rise of Montesiepi itself. This smaller building marks the place of the saint's conversion and death in the 1180s, and the frescoes are found in a vaulted Trecento chapel annexed to this shrine (fig. 13).

In the late Middle Ages, S. Galgano was the most important Cistercian foundation in Tuscany, and the greatest builders and sculptors of the Duecento are believed to have worked at on the abbey church's construction.² But little now remains of this former glory: the last monks left in 1652, after a series of

¹Aelred of Rievaulx, "In Purificatione sanctae Mariae" *Opera Omnia CC IIA*, 267-278, 268.

²Architectural studies include: Daniele Negri, *Abbazie cisterciensi in Italia* (Pistoia, 1981) 149-156; Paola Puglisi, "Componenti federiciane in San Galgano" *Federico II e l'arte del Duecento italiano: Atti della III settimana di studi di storia dell'arte medievale dell'Università di Roma*, 2 vols., ed. Angiola Maria Romanini (Galatina, 1980) I, 379-389; Lelia Fraccaro de Longhi, *L'Architettura delle chiese cisterciensi italiane* (Milan, 1958) 248-252; Hanno Hahn, *Die frühe Kirchenbaukunst der Zisterzienser im Rheingau und ihren europäischen Analogien im 12. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1957), 178-179, 334; Gino Chierici, "Il consolidamento degli avanzi del tempio di San Galgano" *Bollettino d'arte* 4 (1924-25) 129-140; Camille Enlart, "L'Abbaye de San Galgano près de Sienne au treizième siècle" *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art de l'Ecole Française de Rome* 11 (1891) 201-204.

commendatory abbots had stripped the community of anything of value, including the leading that held together the roof of the abbey church.³

Given S. Galgano's ruinous state, it is not surprising the fresco cycle lay almost forgotten until 1904, when Frederick Mason Perkins published reproductions of the paintings for the first time, and proposed an attribution to the Sienese painter Ambrogio Lorenzetti.⁴ Lorenzetti's career is very poorly documented, but the attribution has been almost universally accepted, and there is also general agreement on a date between the mid-1330s and the early 1340s.⁵

Lorenzetti's juxtaposition of the Virgin and Eve occurs in a Maestà lunette within the fresco cycle (fig. 12), and is an excellent initial case study for this thesis. Not only is it almost certainly the earliest surviving example, it is also the only image of Mary and Eve ascribed to a major artist, and has

³Still the best and most complete study: Antonio Canestrelli, *L'Abbazia di S. Galgano* (Florence, 1896, anastatic reprint Pistoia, 1989); see also Giuseppe Amante and Andrea Martini, *L'Abbazia di San Galgano: un insediamento cistercense nel territorio senese* (Florence, 1969).

⁴F. Mason Perkins, "Di alcune opere poco note di Ambrogio Lorenzetti" *Rassegna d'arte* 4 (1904) 186-190; see also: George Rowley, "The Gothic Frescos at Monte Siepi" *Art Studies* 7 (1929) 107-127; Eve Borsook, *Gli affreschi di Montesiepi* (Florence, 1969); Diana Norman, "The Commission for the Frescoes of Montesiepi" *ZfK* 56 (1993) 289-300; Andrew Ladis, "Immortal Queen and Mortal Bride: The Marian Imagery of Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Cycle at Montesiepi" *GdBA* 119 (1992) 189-200; Victor M. Schmidt, "Artistic Imagination versus Religious Function: Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Annunciation at Montesiepi" *The Power of Imagery: Essays on Rome, Italy and the Imagination*, ed. Peter van Kessel (Sant'Oreste, Rome, 1993) 133-148; Berenson (1968) 215-217. For Mary and Eve: Guldan 129-131 and 215-216, Schiller 193-194, Coor 154; Goetz 107, Esche 45, 68.

⁵Most writers now argue for significant workshop contribution, but only Rowley entirely rejects the Lorenzetti attribution, arguing for a figure he dubbed the Monte Siepi Master, and repeating the claim in *Ambrogio Lorenzetti*, 2 vols. (Princeton, NJ, 1958) I, 62-64. For Ambrogio, see also: Hayden Maginnis, "Chiarimenti documentati: Simone Martini, i Memmi, e Ambrogio Lorenzetti" *Rivista d'arte* 41 (1989) 3-23; Valerie Wainwright, "The Will of Ambrogio Lorenzetti" *BM* 117 (1975) 543-544. Lorenzetti is recorded in Sienese documents in June 1337, February 1337/8 to 1339; July 1339, 12 Sept 1341, and in 1345 was working in the Sala dei Novi of the Palazzo Pubblico. He made a will on 9 June, 1348, dying of plague shortly thereafter; extant dated works include the Presentation in the Temple of 1342 (now Uffizi, Florence) and a 1344 Annunciation (now Pinacoteca, Siena).

therefore received detailed art historical treatment; it is the only example to occur within a cycle, providing a larger context for an analysis of the iconography; and it is exceptionally well documented, greatly aiding an attempted reconstruction of the image's creation and audience: there are three massive volumes of surviving documents from the community, called the Caleffi of San Galgano and now in the State Archives in Siena. These are compilations of almost a thousand documents, the earliest dating from 1196, which were brought together and transcribed anew by a series of Sienese notaries between 1319 and 1321; together with a number of surviving wills in the same Archives and in Volterra, this information provides a precious record of the community and its members.⁶

In the following discussion it is argued this cycle should be related to the Cistercian Order's unique devotion to the Virgin Mary, the dominant thread of the Order's own history, and that it is this heightened devotion which determined the use of this first juxtaposition of Mary and Eve. This cult permeated every aspect of the frescoes, and because the Marian imagery functions within the cycle as a whole, it will be necessary to consider all the frescoes, rather than simply the lunette in which Mary and Eve appear; these other images are in fact helpful for determining the particularities of the S. Galgano audience. Thus this chapter will begin with an introduction to Galgano and his images. Next the early history and context of Cistercian S. Galgano are presented, including the Order's own understanding of its history and the saint himself; then the analysis turns to how the Order's specific relation to Mary shaped Lorenzetti's works, and the placement of Eve within

⁶Archivio di Stato di Siena, fondo Conventi, filze 161, 162, 163. Canestrelli's study is based on them and includes an appendix with sixteen of the earliest documents. The wills will be introduced and discussed below.

it. Finally a new suggestion for the patronage of the cycle will be made, proposing that the Cistercians themselves may have been directly responsible for the chapel's creation in Mary's honour.

I. The Saint, his Images, and the Frescoes

Galgano is not a well-known saint, and the dates of his birth, death, and canonisation are in fact uncertain, but a Trecento version of his legend can be reconstructed from the surviving sources.⁷ In this account, Galgano

⁷For images: Kaftal (1952) 423-432. Modern sources for Galgano's legend: Eugenio Susi, *L'eremita cortese: S. Galgano fra mito e storia nell'agiografia toscana del XII secolo* (Spoleto, 1993); Franco Cardini, *San Galgano e la spada nella roccia* (Siena, 1982); Rudolf Arbesmann, "The Three earliest *Vitae* of St. Galganus," *Didascalie: Studies in Honour of Anselm M. Albareda*, ed. Sesto Prete (New York, 1961) 1-37; *AASS Propylaeum decembris*, 69, 561-563; André Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du moyen âge* (Rome, 1981) 41-42. For early modern sources: L. H. Cottineau, *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés* (Mâcon, 1939) II, 2684. All but one of Galgano's early legends have now been published:

Inquisitio in partibus, compiled at Montesiepi August, 1185 [see: Feodor Schneider, "Der Einsiedler Galgan von Chiusdino und die Anfänge von San Galgano" *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 17 (1914-1924) 61-77].

Vita Sancti Galgani, Veroli, Biblioteca Giovardiana, ms. 42.5.14, 253r-264v; Cistercian, probably before 1220, traditionally attributed to one Fra Orlando or Rolando of Pisa [Susi 185-213].

Vita Beati Galgani, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, cod. Plut. 90, sup. 48, 15v-21r; written between 1326 and 1343 by a supporter of the Augustinian friars [Eugenio Susi, "La Vita Beati Galgani del Codice Laurenziano Plut. 90, sup. 48" *Benedictina* 39 (1992) 317-340].

Leggenda di santo Galgano confessore, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, cod. Chig. M.V. 118, 117v-181v; abbreviated, vernacular version of the *Vita Beati Galgani* [Cardini, 101-1].

Blasius, *Legenda sancti Galgani confexoris*, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, cod. Plut. 20, 6, 19r-21r; author unidentified, probably produced in or near Florence, first half of Trecento [unpublished].

De sancto Galgano, Brev. ms. Cisterciense saec. 14, Cod. Casanat. A IV 16 (123); surviving Trecento office [AHMA XXII (1985) 109-110, and XXIV (1896) 219-222].

Guidotti was born in 1148, to noble parents in Chiusdino, a small castello close to Montesiepi (Map II). As a youth, he was given to every kind of vice, until one night he had a dream: the Archangel Michael appeared, and commanded that Galgano become a knight. He did so, but otherwise nothing changed, until some time later Michael appeared again, and ordered Galgano to follow him on a kind of medieval quest: they came to a rushing river, spanned by an immense and dangerous bridge, and with a mill wheel churning furiously below it. On the other side they found a meadow filled with fragrant flowers, and beyond it a round building on a hill. Inside the twelve apostles were waiting, and held out a book to Galgano, said to show Psalm 70, 16: "Because I have not known learning, I will enter into the powers of the Lord: O Lord, I will be mindful of thy justice alone." But the illiterate knight was unable to read it, and, lifting his gaze, he saw the image of Christ in Majesty. The apostles then ordered him to construct the miraculous rotunda in which they stood, in honour of God, the Virgin, St. Michael and themselves. And Galgano awoke.

Some time later the saint was traveling to a nearby town, when suddenly his horse refused to move, and he was forced to turn back and spend the night. But the next day the same thing happened, in the same place. Commending himself to God, Galgano threw the reins over the horse's neck, and it carried him to Monte Siepi; recognising the place of his vision, the saint finally understood Michael's initial command: he was to become a hermit there, a knight of God, not a soldier of the world. His response was immediate: he unsheathed his sword, thrust it into the naked rock to make a cross, and sank before it in prayer.

For about a year Galgano subsisted at Montesiepi on wild grasses and herbs, building a circular hut around his sword in imitation of his vision. He

left his hermitage only once, to go on pilgrimage to Rome, where he was given relics by the pope. While he was away, however, three jealous local clerics attacked his hut and his miraculous sword, and finding they couldn't remove it from the stone, they broke it and fled. Galgano learned of this desecration when Michael appeared to him in Rome, and he returned to Montesiepi and miraculously repaired it. He died, traditionally on December 3, 1181, still kneeling in prayer before the sword in the stone. He was buried beside it, and the present Rotunda was built soon after; the round church was thus both his mausoleum and the fulfillment of his vision, with Galgano's now miracle-working sword enshrined at its centre.⁸

The fourteenth-century chapel housing the frescoes is annexed to this shrine; it is 4.40m wide and 4.95m long (fig. 14).⁹ The images were painted largely in secco and have suffered greatly with time, but as figure 15 indicates, some fresco survives on the quadripartite vault (fig. 17) and on the three outer walls; on the curved inner wall only a tiny fragment remains above the entrance. Each outer wall was once divided into three zones, with a lunette under the vault, a middle band divided by an arched window, and a base of fictive marble wainscoting (fig. 16). The chapel was restored in 1966 under Leonetto Tintori, and a number of the underlying sinopie were discovered intact; these are now displayed in the gaps of the side walls.¹⁰ It is uncertain how many scenes have been lost, but the middle scene of the back (henceforth "east") wall is continuous on both sides of the window, and the sinopie which

⁸The only architectural study is: Lidia Bianchi, "La Rotonda di Monte Siepi" Rivista del R. Istituto d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte 6 (1937-38) 226-259, who argues for a date of c. 1185.

⁹Borsook 10.

¹⁰Borsook 35-38 includes Tintori's technical report; see also Tintori's Antichi colori sul muro: Esperienze nel restauro (Florence, 1989) 56-58.

survive from the north wall suggest it also was at least planned as a single field, perhaps divided into two related narrative episodes (figs. 19, 20); it is possible therefore the third wall also held a single, united scene, or two episodes in a continuous space, and that only two or three scenes have been lost from the outer walls.

Previous studies of these images have tended to treat them, logically enough, as illustrations of Galgano's legend.¹¹ Unfortunately, this will not do: it is not immediately clear what narrative or principal might link even the five scenes that remain, since Galgano himself appears only twice, and only one scene is explicitly taken from his legend. This is the saint's vision of Michael while on pilgrimage in Rome, on the north wall (figs. 18, 19), where Galgano, a large pilgrim's staff in hand, stares at the Archangel Michael sheathing a sword atop the Castello that bears his name. Galgano makes his second appearance in the lunette above the Roman scene (figs. 21, 22), this time as a knight with sword and spurs; he carries the sword in the scabbard, his attribute, and follows Michael toward the adjacent Maestà lunette of the east wall. Following Galgano is a procession of saints escorted by angels of a larger scale. In the opposite lunette another group of saints (fig. 24), more densely massed, approach the Maestà separately and concurrently with Galgano and his train; they too are escorted by angels, and in the corner closest to the Maestà two more angels are kneeling, one holding a lute and the other open-mouthed and apparently singing.¹²

¹¹Borsook is the best and most influential example; an exception is Ladis, who argues for a mariological interpretation, but only of the east wall, and who does not discuss the links of these two scenes to the three others in the chapel.

¹²Rowley 112 claimed there was a landscape in the chapel that might have been placed in the middle band of this wall, citing F. Brogi, *Inventario Generale degli oggetti d'arte della provincia di Siena*. (Siena, 1897) 128-129. But Brogi's description, "VEDUTA di PAESE, ove sopra una torre vedesi un Angelo," must refer to Michael's appearance to Galgano on the opposite wall.

The focus of all these figures is the lunette which dominates the back wall of the chapel, where the Virgin and Child sit on a draped throne (fig. 12). Groups of angels offer shallow baskets of flowers, and they are flanked by standing saints, Paul and John the Baptist on one side, Peter and the Evangelist on the other; eight other haloed figures kneel before the throne. Although usually described as Galgano's vision, this lunette is a very poor illustration of it; the apostles are mostly conspicuous by their absence, and none of the saints kneeling in front of the throne can be justified by the tale, including the five figures closest to Mary at the very centre of the image: two female saints, two obviously Cistercian monks, and Eve who lies before them on the green ground (figs. 25-27). Even more importantly, although she is now shown quite conventionally with her Son, Mary was originally portrayed alone, without the Child, as an enthroned Queen: part of this earlier, underlying composition was found intact during the 1966 restorations, (fig. 28) and shows Mary wore a cloth-of-gold gown, an elaborate jeweled crown on her head, and held a sceptre in one hand and an orb in the other. The composition was altered, probably by a follower of Pietro Lorenzetti fairly soon after its completion, to the more conventional Virgin and Child image;¹³ but it was originally Mary alone, not the Christ of Divine Majesty mentioned in Galgano's vision, who presided over this court.¹⁴

The scene below redoubles both the Marian focus of the cycle, and its confusing nature (fig. 16). It is a very complicated Annunciation, in which

¹³Borsook 32; again, the only dissenter is Rowley 120-122, who claimed the alteration was sixteenth century.

¹⁴A deviation is clear as all written sources mention Christ alone: the *Inquisitio* says "divine esse maiestatis quandam imaginem et speciem;" the Trecento office, "Dei hominis;" the *Vita Beati Galgani*, "Qui est et fuit et erat et qui venturus est, Deus et homo trinus et unus;" the vernacular *Leggenda*: "quelli che fu ed era, e che die venire a ggiudicare el mondo, Idio e Huomo."

several layers of fresco are now visible, and which again was altered from a remarkable initial composition. The first Annunciation, and the sinopia found beneath it, showed an elegant room with a coffered ceiling and a single roof beam supported by a marble column; to the left of the window, Gabriel still kneels within this room, his wings spread behind him. Opposite him, however, Mary was originally shown on her knees (figs. 29, 30), shrinking away and clinging to the column; this was altered to a conventional image of her standing, arms folded across her chest, and with time, both layers have become visible.¹⁵ Furthermore, a ghostly donor figure, not present in the sinopia, was inserted behind Gabriel; he now kneels uneasily on the angel's hem, in a cloak over a darker tunic, and is just possibly tonsured (fig. 31).

It is true fresco alterations did occur in the Trecento: Simone Martini, for instance, was paid in 1321 to replace the heads and hands of at least eight figures in his Palazzo Pubblico Maestà (fig. 34) which had become too dark, and favoured cult images were often updated, as a sign of continuing honour and devotion.¹⁶ But the Montesièpi changes are far more radical and sweeping, suggesting a different logic and raising several important questions: why was Mary first shown alone in the Maestà and cringing on her knees in the Annunciation, and how could the image of the donor of such an important cycle apparently be forgotten until it was too late?

Apart from the frescoes of the Rotunda, there are three other Trecento cycles with scenes of Galgano's life, but these only underline the odd stresses of the frescoes. The earliest and most detailed is found on a large, early-

¹⁵This later version of the composition was adopted by several Sienese painters, including Lippo Vanni and Biagio di Goro, reinforcing the supposition that the changes were made fairly soon after its completion: Freuler (1986) 33-48, 108.

¹⁶Cathleen Hoeniger, *The Renovation of Paintings in Tuscany, 1250-1500* (Cambridge, 1995) especially 43-74 and 127-149.

Trecento, spire-shaped reliquary with eight scenes around its base (fig. 32), created to hold the saint's blond head.¹⁷ On a later, smaller, reliquary from the abbey there are six scenes, concentrating on the saint's arrival at Montesiepi;¹⁸ and finally there are six small panels of c.1390, attributed to Andrea di Bartolo.¹⁹ In all these cycles, Galgano or at least his sword appears in every single scene, which are all clearly taken from his legend. At Montesiepi, however, Galgano appears only twice, and, given the prominent place given to the Annunciation, and the iconography of the three lunettes themselves, including the presence of the female figures, the two Cistercians, and Eve at Mary's feet, it seems clear that Galgano's legend cannot be the only narrative evoked here.

Instead, I would like to propose that the frescoes are best seen as a kind of Cistercian allegory, integrating Galgano's own tale within the wider history of the Cistercians and their special advocate, the Virgin Mary, who lies

¹⁷Il gotico a Siena: miniature pittureoreficerie oggetti d'arte (Siena, Palazzo Pubblico, 24 luglio-30 ottobre 1982) (Florence, 1982) 78-82. The scenes are: Michael brings Galgano to the chapel in his vision, the Archangel leads Galgano's horse to Montesiepi, Galgano cuts branches for a hut, he sinks the sword into the stone, and a group of people discover him kneeling in prayer; he kneels in prayer while the devil attempts to drive him off, he kneels in prayer and the hand of God summons him from the sky, and he is buried by two bishops while a third tonsured figure censes.

¹⁸Giovanni Previtali, "Sculptura e smalto traslucido nell'oreficeria toscana del primo Trecento: una questione preliminare" Prospettiva 79 (1995) 2-17; Roberto Longhi, "Ancora per San Galgano" Paragone 241 (1970) 6-8; Gotico a Siena 117-121. The reliquary is gilded copper, 74 cm tall, and dated to 1315-20; unfortunately it was stolen in 1989. The scenes are: Michael appears to him, Galgano sees Christ and the apostles in the Rotunda, the Archangel stops his horse, the Archangel leads the horse to Montesiepi, Galgano cuts branches to make a hut, and Galgano plants the sword in the stone.

¹⁹ Enzo Carli, Il Museo di Pisa (Pisa, 1974) 61-62; National Gallery of Ireland: Illustrated Summary Catalogue of Paintings (Dublin, 1981), listed under "Bartolo, Andrea di." The first three scenes are closely based on the smaller reliquary series: Michael stops his horse, Michael leads his horse to Montesiepi, and Galgano cuts branches; the last three are the punishments of the three vandals who attacked his sword, Galgano's funeral, and an episode which seems to be a later Trecento addition to his legend: Galgano's relatives try to tempt him from Montesiepi with a prospective fiancée.

at the very heart of these images, honoured as the Second Eve. It is thus necessary to know something of Cistercian S. Galgano and the dominant themes of its history, self-presentation, and ideals before the frescoes can be discussed more fully, and the place of Mary and Eve within them can be understood.

II. Cistercian San Galgano

Modern Cistercian histories list S. Galgano as a 1201 foundation subject to the famous Italian house of Casamari.²⁰ In doing so, they are following two sources: the Duecento Cistercian version of the saint's legend, which describes the abbot of Casamari building the Rotunda and creating the community, and a 1201 listing of the privileges granted to the monks of S. Galgano by the bishop of the diocese of Volterra, which can be interpreted as the founding land grant.²¹ Yet the link to Casamari is completely undocumented, and the 1201 foundation date is at least partly conventional: an 1196 diploma of Emperor Henry VI already mentions "monachos S. Galgano," describing them as "a Claravalle in Tusciam venientes."²² More importantly for our purposes, however, despite the Duecento legend, there is no documented link between Galgano and the Cistercians; the monks' choice of the site was probably determined by the interest and generosity of the bishop of Volterra, rather than by any particular devotion to the saint.²³ The Rotunda

²⁰Negri (as in note 2) 17; the filiation is given as Cîteaux, Clairvaux, Casamari, founded 1201.

²¹*Vita Sancti Galgani* 209; Canestrelli Document III, 107.

²²Canestrelli Document V, 116.

²³Susi 99-117.

itself almost certainly predates the Cistercians' arrival, as the first mentions of a church comes in 1185, more than ten years before the first explicit mention of the monks in the 1196 diploma.²⁴

But if the first Cistercians had no real claim to Galgano himself, he was nevertheless a saint in whom they could find a reflection of their own history and ideals, for they also were noble hermits with a vision. According to the Cistercians' own account of their origins, the Exordium paruum, the Order was founded in 1098 by a group of Burgundian aristocrats seeking a radical renewal of St. Benedict's monastic rule of work and prayer, living in earthly hardship but intent on the fight to serve God.²⁵ The Cistercians were a product of their chivalrous, feudal age: they dedicated their entire order and all their churches to Mary, calling her their Queen and considering her their special patroness and advocate; they withdrew, like Galgano, to live in the wilderness, and offered their struggles to win the Virgin's favour, as contemporary knights did for their ladies.²⁶ The monks' time was divided between the labour and prayer of Benedict's rule, but with a specific constitution of their own, called the Carta caritatis, because, according to its

²⁴The 1185 *Inquisitio* witness Girardino Bindi mentions his son was healed "ad podium, super quo constructa est ecclesia in honorem beati Galgani." A leper was healed by bringing a wax effigy "ad oratorium beati Galgani," a story confirmed by "Isaachus sacerdos et heremita eiusdem ecclesie." It seems unlikely there was an earlier building.

²⁵Philippe Guignard, Les Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne (Dijon, 1878) 59-75 for the Exordium; for this history see also: Louis J. Lekar, The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality (Ohio, 1977); and Bernard Lucet, Les codifications cisterciennes de 1237 et de 1257 (Paris, 1977).

²⁶For the dedications: Guignard 254-255; see in general: Maria in san Bernardo e nella tradizione cistercense: Atti del Convengo Internazionale (Rome, 1993) especially Goffredo Viti and Malachia Falletti, "La devozione a Maria nell'Ordine Cistercense," 287-348. For the chivalrous aspects of Cistercian spirituality: Jean Leclercq, Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France (Oxford, 1979); Michel Zink, La prédication en langue romane avant 1300 (Paris, 1976).

prologue, love was to be the driving force of their lives.²⁷ Thus Galgano was a paradigm of the Cistercians' own ideal monk: a noble who renounced the world to live as a hermit in the wilderness, seeking to become a knight in God (and Mary's) service. Every monk who came to S. Galgano renewed the saint's own conversion, and in daily retracing Galgano's steps, they could move through the wilderness in which he had struggled, worship in the round church of his vision, and draw strength from his miraculous sword in the stone.

By the fourteenth century, however, the community of S. Galgano was in many ways a relic, like Galgano, of an earlier, more feudal age, and perhaps a faintly tarnished relic at that. On the one hand S. Galgano was still an important focus of devotion: pilgrims had started coming to Montesiepi within the saint's own lifetime and they continued to come in the fourteenth century. Galgano had not lost his ability to intercede for the faithful: in 1330, a few years before the frescoes were created, he had ended eight months of drought, when the reliquary containing his head (fig. 32) was paraded through Siena.²⁸ The community's religious influence was also significant, as the monks had acquired rights to older churches and founded daughter houses throughout Tuscany.²⁹

But Galgano's harsh twelfth-century wilderness had become the richest religious institution in the diocese of Volterra: after more than a century of

²⁷"Solam caritatem et animarum utilitatem in divinis et humanis exequitur." Guignard 77-84 for the Carta text; and 1-57 for the Rule of Saint Benedict.

²⁸On October 25, 1330, the abbot of S. Galgano took formal possession of a new daughter house, the Abbey of Quarto, staging a great procession in which the precious relic of Galgano's head was carried. At the Campo, the governors of Siena, the Nove, came out of the Palazzo and kissed the relic one by one, then the procession continued to the new Abbey, and a great miracle occurred. It had been a sunny day, but suddenly the heavens opened, ending eight months of total drought. See: Agnolo di Tura del Grasso, "La Cronaca maggiore" RIS XV/6 498-499.

²⁹Canestrelli 6, and Document XVI, 124-125.

important donations and privileges, S. Galgano owned most of the surrounding countryside, and was housed in one of the most impressive abbeys in Tuscany.³⁰ Moreover, far from living in the pensive isolation, work, and prayer of their ideal, Duecento and Trecento monks served as architects and treasurers of the Sienese government, whose territorial expansion into the Maremma had gradually enveloped the community: thus there are a series of Sienese account books with Cistercians monks on the covers.³¹ And as elsewhere in the Order, most of the occupants of the abbey were probably illiterate lay-brothers, called conversi, who did the manual work the choir monks had long since abjured.³²

Moreover, even the Cistercians' original, radical poverty and reform had been outstripped by the newer Mendicant orders, who now provided the dominant models of piety: they were urban, often learned, oriented toward the lay populations, and busy promoting the competing cults of popular Sienese saints of their own.³³ Worse still, with the foundation of the Augustinian hermits in 1256, a counter-claim to Galgano had been born. Within Galgano's own lifetime, a group of followers had assembled around him; they continued

³⁰In the 1302-1303 "Decima" S. Galgano was assessed at 145 pounds, more than twice the second highest assessment, for the "Episcopatus:" RDI Tusciae I 199; for privileges and property: Canestrelli 25-37 and Documents I- III and V-XVII, 107-110 and 116-125.

³¹Canestrelli 19-24 and Documents XIX and XX, 126-128. Monks served as treasurers of Siena at least fifteen times between 1258 and 1350; for the "biccherne," or account book covers: Le Biccherne: Tavole dipinte delle Magistrature senesi (secoli XIII-XVIII) (Florence, 1984).

³²Michael Toepfer, Die Konversen der Zisterzienser: Untersuchungen über ihren Beitrag zur mittelalterlichen Blüte des Ordens (Berlin, 1983); Edmond Mikkers, "L'idéal religieux des frères convers dans l'Ordre de Cîteaux aux 12e et 13e siècles," and Clemens Van Dijk, "L'instruction et la culture des frères convers dans les premiers siècles de Cîteaux," both Collectanea ordinis cisterciensium reformatorum 24 (1962) 113-129 and 243-258.

³³For these competing cults: André Vauchez, "La Commune de Sienne, les ordres mendiants et le culte des saints. Histoire et enseignements d'une crise (novembre 1328-avril 1329)" Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome 89 (1977) 751-767.

to live at his tomb, and they testified at his trial. But this changed with the arrival of the Cistercians; the two groups seem to have coexisted for a few years, but in the late 1190s or early 1200s, the hermits either willingly or unwillingly decamped, taking some relics of the saint and founding a number of central Italian hermitages in Galgano's name. The Augustinians were created from the union of disparate groups of hermits, including, presumably, what was left of Galgano's original followers, and sometime between 1326 and 1343 they produced a legend presenting Galgano as a saint of their Order, whom the Cistercians had usurped.³⁴

There is no written evidence that the Cistercians were troubled by this claim, or by their somewhat diminished spiritual importance. Yet although it may simply be a coincidence, in the first half of the Trecento the monks of S. Galgano either commissioned or acquired the frescoed chapel and at least five other important works: a pastoral staff showing Galgano kneeling in prayer before the rotunda sword, an enamel crown, the two reliquaries mentioned earlier, and a series of relief carvings.³⁵ These works have not been linked to the fresco cycle, but all of them, significantly, present scenes from Galgano's

³⁴For the Augustinians: David Gutierrez, Los Agustinos en la edad media 1256-1356 (Rome, 1980), and F. Roth, "Cardinal Richard Annibaldi First Protector of the Augustinian Order 1243-1276" Augustiniana 2 (1952) 26-60. For the Augustinian legend claiming Galgano: Susi (1992), and Arbesmann.

³⁵Ilaria Toesca, "Gli smalti della corona di San Galgano" Paragone 241 (1970) 3-6; Gert Kreytenberg, "Der heilige Galganus und der Bildhauer Agostino di Giovanni" Pantheon 51 (1993) 4-17; and Il gotico a Siena 195-197 and 205-208. For the two reliquaries, see nts. 17 and 18. The crown, head reliquary and pastoral staff are now in the Museo dell'Opera del Duomo, Siena; one of the reliefs is in a private collection, the other in the parish church of Chiusdino, and the smaller reliquary, once kept in Frosini near Montesiepi, was stolen in 1989 and has not been recovered. Other objects may have been acquired in this period: in his 1897 inventory Brogi 128-129 mentions a "Calice di rame dorato e smalto avente il piedi di forma esagonale coi lati curvi e sei angoli sporgenti...Nella sottocoppa vi sono sie serafini di vetro smaltato. Altezza 0.20 m, diametro del piede 0.14. Opera del secolo XIV." Pietro Toesca, Il Trecento (Turin, 1964) 303 nt. 71 and 932 nt. 176 mentions a Madonna "supposta di Ramo di Paganello," and a "Madonna di Monte Siepi," no longer at the foundation.

legend surrounded by the most important Cistercian saints and symbols of Montesiepi; together with the frescoes they might be termed a Cistercian counter-attack in these years, reaffirming the Cistercians' own ideals through the image of their saintly founder, and casting Galgano in a fully Cistercian likeness.

The Lorenzetti frescoes would be the most sophisticated instance of this presentation, at the very heart of Cistercian Montesiepi, the Rotunda shrine: for they present an idealised image of the community and history of the foundation, the cloister of S. Galgano as the Virgin Mary's Cistercian court. However unlike a knightly Court of Mary Trecento S. Galgano had become, this original ideal still gave structure and meaning to the lives of its monks, and it seems clear that it also helped to determine the stresses of the fresco images, culminating, in fact, in the juxtaposition of Mary and Eve at the very centre of the cycle. I would now like to turn to these images.

III. Queen of the Cistercian Court

Mary's importance to the cycle is even apparent in the one scene obviously from Galgano's legend, his vision of Michael while on pilgrimage in Rome (figs. 18, 19). As Eve Borsook has noted, this composition is based on earlier images of Michael sheathing his sword atop the Castello to announce the end of a plague.³⁶ Even so, it is striking the physical location of the vision should be so carefully portrayed: a basilica that might be Saint Peter's appears behind the Castello, while Galgano is shown on the other side of the Ponte Sant'Angelo across the Tiber, and another basilica appears behind the saint

³⁶Borsook 17-19.

over the window arch.³⁷ The carefully studied specificity of this setting can be compared to the Rome shown in a scene of about 1368 by the Sienese artist Biagio di Goro, in the church of S. Michele at Paganico: Michael is shown atop the Castello announcing the end of the plague, but no comparable attempt has been made to place the Castello in a coherent, recognisable Roman topography.³⁸

The Montesiepi scene has no extant counterpart elsewhere, and its inclusion is significant in the church of Galgano's vision, where pilgrims came to find the saint; it also may have stressed Galgano's orthodoxy and devotion to the apostles whom he had gone to Rome to honour, and possibly the miraculous nature and protection of Montesiepi and its sword. Yet its specificity suggests another, potentially greater, reason for its inclusion, which lies in its juxtaposition with the Annunciation (fig. 16).³⁹ The visual parallels are pervasive, especially since the Annunciation also originally took place in a carefully particularised setting, with Mary cringing and clinging to a column on the floor (figs. 29, 30). As Victor Schmidt has recently shown, this image

³⁷The surviving sinopia fragment suggests the scene was at least planned to continue, with the same specificity, on the other side of the window: it includes a building with an arcaded drum, a campanile, and a hexagonal or octagonal building with a rose window; together, they are suggestive of a basilica complex, such as the Lateran palace. But the fresco above the window arch shows a generic building quite different from the underlying drawing, and it cannot be assumed the missing scene followed the sinopia.

³⁸Freuler (1986) 77-79 for Paganico; the specificity of the Roman scene suggests Lorenzetti or someone advising him was familiar with Rome.

³⁹This scene has received more attention than any other. In addition to other sources: Dorothea and Pieter Diemer, "Turbata est in sermone eius: zu einer ungewöhnlichen Verkündigungsdarstellung des Ambrogio Lorenzetti" Befund und Deutung: zum Verhältnis von Empirie und Interpretation in Sprach- und Literaturwiss, ed. Klaus Grubmüller (Tübingen, 1979) 154-168; H.W. van Os, Marias Demut und Verherrlichung in der sienesischen Malerei 1300-1450 (s'Gravenhag, 1969) 58 and nt. 71; Millard Meiss, The Great Age of Fresco: Giotto to Pontormo (New York, 1968) 64-70; Henk van Os, "Marginal Notes on the Great Age of Fresco" Simiolus 4 (1970) 6-12; Juergen and Anne Markham Schulz, "The Great Age of Fresco in New York" AB 111 (1969) 50-55, and 303-304 for a response by Borsook.

depended on stories which circulated in Trecento Italy: in Nazareth, there was a grotto-like shrine which marked the supposed location of the Annunciation, and Christian crusaders had constructed a church above it, built on supporting columns, which were therefore very prominent in the small shrine itself. Probably to account for their presence, the story circulated among later pilgrims that Mary had grasped a column in fear and surprise when Gabriel entered her room. There are in fact other Trecento Annunciations where Mary grasps a column, although the seated and twisting posture is unique to Montesiepi; Schmidt believes it may have been suggested by works such as Simone Martini's Annunciations in Antwerp and St. Petersburg, where Mary is seated but twisting away from the archangel.⁴⁰ He also argues, very plausibly, that this original composition was changed when the donor was inserted, as it would have been strange for him to kneel in adoration before a Virgin apparently cowering at the sight of him, although Schmidt offers no reasons for this late inclusion.⁴¹

But given this story, what this original image suggests is that Lorenzetti sought to depict both the Annunciation and the Roman scene with as much topographical specificity as possible. This may have been to stress the historical truth of both callings, although presumably neither was in doubt, but it also underlined what might be termed their typological similarities: both Galgano and Mary had been called by an archangel to respond to God's will, and after a moment of surprise and hesitation in Mary's case, rather longer in Galgano's, both responded appropriately. The Annunciation was of course the most important instant of a divine calling transforming a human being,

⁴⁰Schmidt 138-148. Both Borsook 29-30 and Ladis 190-192 discuss some of the stories about Mary and the column in Nazareth; for the Martini images: Martindale 171-173, and 214-215.

⁴¹Schmidt 146.

explicitly evoked by the Galgano of Trecento legend as he is led to Montesiepi;⁴² and in the linking of the two scenes, Mary's visit by the Archangel has become a point of reference for Galgano's own story.

This potential link between the head of the Cistercian Order and the patron of the community was reinforced because each figure's transformed state appeared in the lunette directly above. Over the Roman scene, Galgano follows Michael toward Mary in the Maestà (figs. 21, 22); following him are two bishops and another priest, similarly attired, and then a group of saints with angels, but about half the scene has been lost at the left and only a young blonde saint is clearly visible.⁴³ But here the setting is surprisingly vague: a green ground and blue sky, with a now-effaced banderole emerging from the frame directly over their heads. This image has been identified as Michael leading Galgano to Montesiepi in his vision or else bringing him to Heaven at his death;⁴⁴ and certainly some passage or transformation is implied: the central bishop behind Galgano is dressed for Mass and holding some type of garment or cloth (fig. 23), and this garment's closest parallel is found on the reliquary of Galgano's head (fig. 32), where to indicate Galgano's conversion at Montesiepi, he is shown giving away a garment, held by a figure standing beside him. In the fresco, however, Galgano's conversion is explicitly sacralised, for his cast-off is accepted by a bishop, not a peasant. Yet the

⁴²For instance: *Leggenda di santo Galgano confessore* 105-106, where Galgano says a prayer which is very close to the *Credo*, and which mentions "nel tenpo(sic) de la plenitudine de la gratia, del seno del tuo Padre nel ventre de la Vergine Maria descendesti vestito de la nostra humanitate," finishing "dirizzami ne le tue semite e ne la tua via e nell'opere de' tuoi comandamenti, accio che, al tuo servizio devotissimamente stando, lo promesso habito di cavaliere meriti d'acquistare, lo quale ne la visione mi mostrasti."

⁴³Borsook 16 claims the confused massing of figures beyond the blond saint can be separated into four major figures with another figure, probably a Cistercian monk, kneeling in front of them, but this seems to be contradicted by a close examination of the image.

⁴⁴Borsook 15-17.

details of the scene do not identify a precise episode: if the Archangel is most associated with Galgano's arrival at Montesiepi, the three clerics attending Galgano are linked to his death: he is in fact buried by two bishops and a third cleric on the head reliquary.⁴⁵ Even Galgano's attribute has several meanings: the sword in stone of the Rotunda was his personal sign, but also the emblem of his community, which adorned the tokens pilgrims took away with them, and the abbot's pastoral staff.⁴⁶

The logic of the opposite lunette is clear, however, and it is also enlightening (fig. 24). Above the two kneeling angels at the far left, David is crowned and holds a large psalter; he was the author of the psalm shown to Galgano by the apostles. To his right is a man with a white beard and T-shaped cross, probably Saint Andrew: in the Duecento Cistercian legend Galgano had died on Andrew's feast day.⁴⁷ Also visible are Stephen, clutching a book to his chest and with two stones stuck to his tonsured head, and Fabian, the pope with a large sword; Galgano had received relics of both while in Rome. Beyond Fabian are two saints, both apparently female: the closer one, holding a large arrow, is probably Ursula, who may also have been linked to

⁴⁵These clerics are not included in any contemporary legends, though the bishops of Massa and Volterra are mentioned in later versions. Susi 29-39 suggests the fresco figures may be the clerics who oversaw the trial for Galgano's canonisation, although this would not fully explain their haloes.

⁴⁶The sword in stone is used as Galgano's attribute in Trecento images of him, including for instance a panel by the Maestro d'Ovile from Fogliano, c. 1330 (Pinacoteca, Siena): Torriti 130-131. But it was also the symbol and centre of Cistercian Montesiepi itself, and in fourteenth-century documents the Rotunda is described as "domum S. Galgani de podio ala sassa" while the Abbey church can be "iuxta domum S. Galgani que est subtus saxe," suggesting its defining role: ASS, Conventi 163, 320r, 113r. For the tokens: Canestrelli 12, Enlart (as in nt 2) 231.

⁴⁷"MCLXXX primo, pridie Kalendis Decembris....Dies ille celebritate gemina festivus, quia et Andree apostoli festivitatis gaudium celebratur et Galgani confessoris." *Vita Sancti Galgani* 204.

the abbey's history in some way, as she is recorded to have been represented on a later altarpiece in the abbey.⁴⁸

Thus all those represented here are saints linked to the founding and history of the community, and given the lack of specificity noted in the other lunette, where Galgano appears with Michael (figs. 21, 22), it seems possible it too should be seen as a synthetic image of the community of S. Galgano's own history, beginning with Galgano and Michael, rather than an illustration of the saint's conversion. With Michael's help, Galgano brings the foundation at Montesiepi to Mary and her court of saints, with a group of followers in his wake. These are difficult to identify, because only the blonde saint is reasonably intact, but they must be linked to him somehow; they might possibly be patron saints of S. Galgano's daughter houses, so that the blonde saint could be Giuliana for the Perugian nunnery of that name, although several important houses would be unrepresented in this account.⁴⁹

I have dwelt on these images at some length because their particular nature is important to the interpretation of the final one, the Maestà. It is clear the lunettes especially are as much about the history of the community of S. Galgano as they are about the saint himself, and that they depend on a fairly detailed knowledge of that history; furthermore, they are not so much as

⁴⁸Brogi's inventory lists a painting of the "Madonna col Bambino, Galgano ed Orsola genuflessi, D. Manetti, XVIIe." Brogi 128-129. Borsook 20-2 made these same identifications, except for Andrew, but only for Stephen and Fabian did she propose a reason for their inclusion.

⁴⁹An obvious example is the bishop saint Cerbone, patron of a daughter-house in the diocese of Lucca, whom Lorenzetti himself painted at Massa Maritima (fig. 35), complete with his attribute, a flock of geese: Diana Norman, "'In the Beginning was the Word': An Altarpiece by Ambrogio Lorenzetti for the Augustinian Hermits of Massa Maritima" *ZfK* 4 (1995) 478-503. The other foundations whose saints would be expected are: S. Pantaleone and S. Cerbone (diocese of Lucca), S. Salvatore a Settimo (Florence), S. Prospero (Siena), S. Bernardo (Pisa), S. Giuliana (Perugia); S. Michele della Verrucca, S. Maria di Mirteto and S. Ermete (Pisa), S. Donato in Polverosa (Florence), and S. Andrea, S. Maria Novella and S. Michele a Quarto (Siena): Canestrelli 6; see Kaftal (1952) and (1965) for iconographies.

illustrations as composites or even allegories, S. Galgano's history personified through its saints. This is also the key to the image of Mary and Eve which anchors the whole cycle (fig. 12).

In some ways this is a quite traditional Sienese Maestà: angels offer baskets of flowers to the Virgin, who is flanked by kneeling saints, and Paul, John the Baptist, John the Evangelist, and Paul. Angels and the same four figures appear in Duccio's Maestà in the Sienese Duomo (fig. 33), in Simone Martini's Maestà for the Palazzo Pubblico (fig. 34), and in Lippo Memmi's Maestà in S. Gimignano.⁵⁰ In this sense, Lorenzetti's image at Montesiepi might be seen as proof of Duccio's continuing influence, or as another example of S. Galgano's continuing co-optation into the Sienese state, expressed, as in the subject town of S. Gimignano, by an overtly Sienese Virgin in Majesty (and by the choice of a Sienese artist as well).

Crucially, however, Galgano is now bringing his sword in the stone toward a scene in which his own vision in the Rotunda has become a Cistercian court of Heaven, where the Virgin, their queen, is flanked by the greatest saints of their order. As mentioned, Mary was originally shown alone, with the attributes of a Queen; this surprising image was quite justified, however, as it stressed her role as Advocate and Ruler of the Cistercian Order, the figure at the heart of the S. Galgano community.⁵¹ The Virgin is also the apex of a triangle of five figures, two haloed females, two Cistercian monks, and Eve. The monk kneeling to Mary's proper right, the position of honour, is an elderly man with a bald pate and forked beard, while his companion has brown hair, a blue-green dress, and a simple cap; she holds a dim grey object,

⁵⁰Florens Deuchler, *Duccio* (Milan, 1984) 46-153, 210-215; Martindale 16-17, 204-209.

⁵¹The theme of Mary as Queen will developed more fully in the next chapter.

probably flowers, toward Mary, and a very large straw basket in her other hand (fig. 25).⁵² The other monk is clean-shaven and middle-aged; his companion has long blond hair and a gold crown with thin waving spikes; she wears a simple tunic, with a mantle of a deeper colour with a gold border and lining. Her left hand is raised, the thumb cocked back as if indicating the monk beside her, whose hands are crossed at his breast at the same level, while with her right hand she offers a triangular, dark red object to Mary, possibly a heart (fig. 26).

Again, this composition is reminiscent of both the Duccio and Simone Martini *Maestà*, where the patron saints of Siena kneel before Mary's throne; in the Palazzo Pubblico, there are even two angels offering flowers at the centre of the image, not unlike these female figures. Such compositions normally imply an exchange, often of honours or authority.⁵³ But the Montesiepi monks are not giving or taking anything from Mary directly; in no other image does the triangle of exchanges involve mediating figures as directly, and this relation is key to the Montesiepi cycle, and to Eve's place within it.

I would identify the two monks as Benedict of Montecassino (c. 480-550), in the position of honour as the founder of Western monasticism whose rule ran the Cistercian cloister, and Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), the Order's greatest and most famous saint; the two are in fact found paired in images from S. Galgano's daughter houses.⁵⁴ Their two female companions

⁵²Rowley 116 suggested she held a carrot symbolising the fruits of the earth; Borsook 25 a small bunch of flowers; Norman (1993) 297 some stalks of grain.

⁵³On the development and use of this composition: John Paoletti, "The Strozzi altarpiece reconsidered" *Memorie domenicane* 20 (1989) 279-300.

⁵⁴This identification is supported by Laura Dal Prà, ed., *Bernardo di Chiaravalle nell'arte italiana dal XIV al XVIII secolo* (Milan, 1990), 50; Bernard was first suggested by Meiss (as in

are more complicated, however. They are usually identified as dual personifications of charity, Amor Dei and Amor Proximi: by assimilation of Amor Proximi to Misericordia, she was often given a cornucopia with fruit and flowers as her attribute, and the burning nature of Amor Dei gave her a flaming heart.⁵⁵ Yet when Ambrogio Lorenzetti himself came to represent Charity on his Massa Maritima altarpiece (fig. 35), he showed a carefully-labeled woman with wings, a jeweled crown, and in a clinging white toga, holding a long arrow and a flaming heart; his flying Charity in the Sienese Sala della Pace is very similar, and both these figures are not unlike the figure beside Bernard at Montesiepi.⁵⁶ But the identification of the other figure as Misericordia does not explain either her basket, distinct from her usual attribute, a cornucopia, or her small bunch of flowers. The two women are also similar, however, to two figures taken from a cycle of the theological and cardinal virtues from Perugia, representing Active and Contemplative Life (fig. 36).⁵⁷ The first is a crowned figure in a simple but elegant dress, her hands together in prayer and her eyes raised to heaven; in the dado below her is a hermit reading in a desolate landscape. Her companion, in a patterned

while F. Mason Perkins, "Affreschi poco conosciute di Ambrogio Lorenzetti" La Diana 4 (1929) 261-268 mentioned Benedict might be identified, without specifying a figure. Benedict and Bernard are paired on a Trecento altarpiece by the Master of the Rinuccini Chapel from S. Salvatore a Settimo, one of S. Galgano's daughter-houses (now Accademia, Florence): see Dal Prà 36, 106-107. Galgano is also included, and shown in a predella scene praying before his sword in a woody landscape, with his horse behind him.

⁵⁵The identification was first proposed by Rowley 115; see now: Robert Freyhan, "The Evolution of the Caritas Figure in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries" JWCI 11 (1948) 68-86; and in general Adolf Katzenellenbogen, Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Medieval Art (Toronto, 1989).

⁵⁶For Massa: Norman (1995); for the Sala: Randolph Starn and Loren Partridge, Arts of Power: Three Halls of State in Italy, 1300-1600 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1992) 11-80.

⁵⁷Giovanni Previtali, "Affreschi di Cola Petruccioli" Paragone 193 (1966) 33-43; Mario Salmi, "Un ciclo di affreschi umbri nella Galleria Nazionale di Budapest" BDSPU 51 (1954) 73-82, who misinterprets the two figures, but provides more detailed descriptions.

overdress, holds a small bunch of flowers, and the scene below is a carefully tended garden; each can be identified by a verse at her feet.⁵⁸

It seems possible, therefore, that in these figures Charity has been conflated with Active and Contemplative Life, a combination which could only make sense within the Cistercian Order. I would argue they are intended to indicate the double nature of the Cistercians' offering to Mary, their Queen, as expressed through Benedict's Rule, which proscribed a balance of work and prayer, Active and Contemplative Life, and the Cistercians' own stress on charity as the force which ran their cloister under their Carta caritatis.⁵⁹ Together, therefore, Benedict and Bernard, and "Active and Contemplative Charity" represented the Cistercians before the Virgin (and themselves) as the patrons of Siena represented their city in the Duccio or Martini Maestà (figs. 33, 34, 34); the surrounding saints, a pope, a hermit, a bishop, and a military saint must also be linked to the Cistercians' history and Rule.⁶⁰

In this lunette, then, Galgano's vision of Montesiepi has become an idealised image of the Cistercian family, with its greatest saints united by their rule under the Virgin; it is this perfect Cistercian Court of Mary that Galgano

⁵⁸For Active Life, it reads: "Colto ò di vostre fiore/sorelle miei per esser più giuliva/però ch'io so' la vostra vita/activa;" for Contemplative Life: "Disposto ò el mio desire/nel contemplare de le superne/rote che sono mosse da quel che tucto puote." Previtali 37; Salmi 76-77.

⁵⁹For the Cistercians and Charity: Bernard of Clairvaux, "Liber de diligendo dei" Opera, 7 vols., eds. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais (Rome, 1968) III, 119-154; Aelred of Rievaulx, "De speculo caritatis" and "Compendium speculi caritatis" Opera Omnia I, CC IIA, 3-161, 173-238; more generally: M. Basil Pennington, "Two Treatises on Love" St. Bernard of Clairvaux: Studies Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of his Canonization, ed. M. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo, 1977) 137-154; and in the same volume: G.L.J. Smerillo, "Caritas in the Initial Letters of St. Bernard," 118-136.

⁶⁰Thus the pope behind Benedict might be Gregory, his biographer, and the bishop behind Bernard might be Augustine, or perhaps Ambrose, who was used as the authority for the Cistercians' liturgy. The man in the cowl behind Gregory is probably a hermit father, maybe Anthony Abbot, and the knightly figure beside Ambrose may be Saint Sebastian, (Galgano was supposed to have received a relic of the saint in Rome), Julian, or another military figure.

now joins at Michael's invitation, and this is the vision that those who came to the Rotunda were now invited to share.⁶¹ Yet in order to create this image of paradise, the Cistercians of S. Galgano had to live according to their Rule, in poverty, chastity, and especially obedience: as Aelred of Rievaulx had argued, they owed their Lady Mary this "honorem, servitium, amorem, laudem," because she had undone Eve's sin.⁶² I would now like to turn to the juxtaposition of Mary and Eve, the final aspect of the cycle.

IV. Exules Filii Evae

Given Mary's pre-eminent role as the Cistercians' Lady and Ruler, in some ways it is not surprising the first use of this specific formulation of that great theme of Marian praise, her role as the Second Eve, should come in a Cistercian context. And although no specific precedent for the imagery can be determined, it is even possible somewhat similar French compositions, such as those mentioned in the Introduction, were known to the S. Galgano Cistercians, as the abbots of the community were required to travel through France to Cîteaux to attend General Chapters.⁶³

Whatever its origins, however, this first Eve at Mary's feet is an image of carefully balanced positive and negative aspects (fig. 27). She is

⁶¹Even the vault prophets reinforced this conflation (fig. 17). Only two of the three can be identified, as the prophet above the Maestà is partially effaced, but in the south vault Haggai holds a scroll with: "Magna (erit) gloria domus istius novissimae"(2,9), while across from him Habakkuk's scroll adds: "Operuit caelos gloria eius et laudis eius plena est terra"(3,3). They might refer to the creation of the Rotunda, or of the chapel. These suggestions: Borsook 16, Norman (1993) 296. More generally, however, they can be linked to the community of the "domus Sancti Galgani" itself.

⁶²Aelred of Rievaulx, "In Nativitate Sanctae Mariae," CCIIA 185-189, 185-186.

⁶³The Carta Caritatis required the abbot of a Cistercian house to attend the General Chapter at Cîteaux every year: Guignard 245.

shown with blond hair in two heavy braids, and dressed in a white tunic which lies in thin folds. There is a brown animal skin over her shoulders: it extends on the ground behind her and has little cloven feet attached, one draped over her left thigh, another just visible near the braid on her right shoulder, and possibly a third on the ground behind her. Her right leg is bent in toward her and her left bent and planted on the ground; both feet are bare. But the snake which appears in later images is noticeably absent: the overt references to the temptation are found only in her attributes, a branch with leaves and a large fig, and a scroll inscribed, somewhat corruptly:

FEI PECCATO: PCH PASSIO
NE SOFERSE: XNO CHEQVES
TA: REHA SORTE : NELVENTRE:
AMOSTRA REDENTIONE.⁶⁴

This banner is important, for it is longer and more detailed than those that will be given to Eve in almost all later Mary/Eve paintings. Inscriptions in Trecento painting are usually seen as prescriptive, and Eve's banner has been linked to the defamatory verses of Trecento "pittura infamante," in which criminals or traitors would be depicted on public buildings with inscriptions describing their heinous deeds.⁶⁵ Yet it is in fact rather neutral in tone, and much less charged than the "serpens decipit me" attributed to her in other works; the words here simply state "fei peccato," admitting her weakness, before stressing Mary's role in redeeming it. This relative openness seems

⁶⁴First discussed by Guido Mazzoni, "L'Eva di Monte Siepi" *Bollettino d'arte* 30 (1936) 149-150. There has been some debate about this text, which I would translate: "I sinned, for which Christ, carried in the womb of this queen, suffered the Passion for our Redemption." Norman (1993) 296 nt. 16 interprets this "I have sinned and for this reason endured suffering, until the point that this queen obtained in the womb our redemption," but "soferse" should be a third-person singular verb.

⁶⁵For writing as prescriptive: Starn and Partridge (as in nt. 56) 28-46; for *la pittura infamante*: Grondona 172-173.

potentially significant, given Eve's position between the two saintly monks and the personifications of their Rule.

Yet it is not immediately clear why the Cistercians particularly should have wanted this iconographic innovation. Certainly, in the Trecento they had a long pedigree as Mary's devotees: Bernard was himself regarded as Mary's greatest supporter, no doubt a further reason for his inclusion here.⁶⁶ Yet none of the Cistercian fathers was a great innovator in their writings on Mary and Eve: the theme tends to occur in the traditional context of sermons for Marian feast, with one writer echoing another. In fact, even Bernard wrote relatively little on the Virgin, and while his writings on Mary and Eve would be extremely influential in style, they are entirely traditional in content.⁶⁷ A few examples will suffice: for the Virgin's Nativity, Bernard notes Eve is excused by Mary, while the Virgin's freedom from Eve's curse comes up twice in the fourth sermon for the Eve of the Nativity, and again in the third of Bernard's Four Homilies on the Annunciation.⁶⁸ In his second Homily, he relates the woman of Genesis 3, 15, the Proto-evangelium, to Mary, and cruel Eve is transformed into redeeming Mary for the Sunday of the Octave of the Assumption.⁶⁹ Similarly, Bernard's disciple Guerric of Igny (c. 1070-1157)

⁶⁶Dal Prà 48-54.

⁶⁷Jean Leclercq, Bernard de Clairvaux (Paris, 1989), 121-128; Bernard's autograph Marian writings are: In Laudibus Virginis Matris (i.e. Missus est Angelus or the Four Homilies on the Annunciation); Letter 174 to the Canons of Lyon; the Sermon "De aquaeductu" for the Nativity, several sermons for the Assumption and its Octave, and a few other fragments. Leclercq stresses Bernard's only real innovation was the metaphor of the Virgin as aqueduct of grace, which had limited success outside Cistercian circles.

⁶⁸Bernard of Clairvaux, "In Nativitate Beatae Mariae" Opera V, 275-288, 278-279; "In Vigilia Nativitatis Domini" Opera IV, 220-228, 223; "In Laudibus Virginis Matris" Opera IV, 13-58, 40-41.

⁶⁹"In Laudibus Virginis Matris" Opera IV, 23-24; "Dominica infra Octavam Assumptionis" Opera V, 262-274, 262-263.

told his brothers for the Virgin's Nativity: "Nata est hodie Mater nova, quae prime matris maledictionem dissolvit ut per istam benedictionem haereditate possideant, qui per illam sub praejudicio maledicti aeterni fuerant nati."⁷⁰ And Amadeus, Bishop of Lausanne (1110-1159), wrote: "Decebat enim ut sicut per feminam mors, sic per feminam vita intraret in orbem terrarum. Et sicut in Eva omnes moriebantur, ita in Maria omnes resurgerent. Illa male credula verbis serpentis, mortis venenum miscuerat. Haec conterens caput serpentis, antidotum vitae cunctis ministravit, ut mortem occideret et vitam repararet."⁷¹ In these Cistercian writings, the contrast between the two women is typically intensified, debasing Eve to increase Mary's subsequent praise; in this, their writings were very much in line with those of their learned contemporaries, as discussed in the last chapter, but it is not clear why the inclusion of Eve in the *Maestà* should be thought a worthy expression of Mary's honour by a group of Trecento Italian monks of the Order.

Yet while such writings would have been read for the Marian feasts, they probably were heard relatively seldom otherwise. In the Cistercian liturgy, on the other hand, there were four Marian antiphons which would have been heard at regular intervals: Regina caeli, Alma redemptoris mater, Ave regina caelorem, and Salve regina. Of these the most frequently sung was probably the Salve regina, which formed part of the Office of the Virgin, known to some degree even among the otherwise illiterate lay-brothers; it was included in the liturgies of every major Marian feast, and from 1251 was sung

⁷⁰Guerric, Abbot of Igny, "Sermones per annum," PL 185, 199-201; he also contrasts Mary and Eve in a sermon on the Purification, PL 185, 75-76.

⁷¹Amadeus, Bishop of Lausanne, "De Maria Virginea Matre, Homiliae Octo," PL 188, 1311. Elsewhere in the work he contrasts Eve's childbirth and Mary's, and later reminds his audience that Eve's trust in the serpent was the cause of death and Mary's faith brought life eternal, and that in Mary her mother Eve is to be praised: PL 188, 1323, 1338, 1343.

every single day after Compline.⁷² Furthermore, the Salve was commonly said to have been granted to Bernard by the Virgin herself: one night he had a vision, not unlike Galgano's own, in which Mary appeared surrounded by a choir of angels singing the Salve in her honour. The hymn therefore formed part of the legendary hagiography of the Cistercians, a reminder of the special privileges granted to them, which no doubt added to its force.⁷³ Against the frescoes the text of the Salve is suggestive:

Salve regina misericordiae
 Vita, dulcedo et spes nostra, salve.
 Ad te clamamus, exules filii evae,
 ad te suspiramus, gementes et flentes,
 in hac lacrimarum valle.
 Eia ergo, advocata nostra,
 illos tuos misericordes oculos ad nos converte:
 et ihesum, benedictum fructum ventris tui,
 nobis post hoc exilium ostende
 O clemens, o pia, o dulcis Maria.⁷⁴

Within the text of the Salve, the singer positions himself as Eve's miserable son; this status provokes his plea for mercy to the Queen of Mercy, his advocate, while the humble admission of inherited, feminised weakness justifies his call.

I am not suggesting that the Salve was the source for the Montesiepi Maesta, nor that some similar written source provided the composition,

⁷²José Maria Canal, Salve Regina Misericordia: Historia y leyendas en torno a esta antifona (Rome, 1963) 46, 116-117: it was the antiphon ad evangelium, at Vespers and the Magnificat for the feast of the Purification, the Annunciation, and the Nativity of the Virgin; also sung ad Laudes and ad Benedictus for the Assumption and ad Benedictus on the Saturday of the Octave. For the Virgin's Office among lay-brothers: Mikkers (as in nt. 32) 124.

⁷³Canal 59. This story was circulating by c. 1160, and was included in the Life of Bernard in the Golden Legend; the Salve actually predates the Cistercians, and other religious Orders told similar tales.

⁷⁴Canal 46.

although I would not be the first to do so.⁷⁵ Rather, given the stress within the image on the Order and its Rule, I would argue that, like the Eve of the Salve, the Eve of Montesiepi has taken some of the burden of the monks' weakness as Mary's earthly servants, allowing them to stress their corresponding need for her advocacy. This suggestion relies on both textual parallels and the apparent assumptions about interpretation and audience within the frescoes themselves, and I would like to discuss both of these briefly in turn.

Throughout their writings, in fact, Cistercians happily blur biological sex to further spiritual metaphor, describing themselves in feminine terms to express a range of ideas.⁷⁶ More importantly, however, for Cistercians as for many of their contemporaries, the weakness of one's own flesh could be personified, perhaps above all else, in Eve.⁷⁷ For, as we have seen, medieval views of generation argued the child's flesh was formed entirely from the flesh of the mother, linking all human flesh to the feminine, and therefore back to the first mother, Eve; and her sin and its weakness was the inherited human condition. This metaphor could take very concrete forms, especially when combined with the older monastic theme of the cloister as a paradise, such as

⁷⁵Paul Schubring, "Italienische Bilder des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts im Museum Schnütgen in Köln" Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst (1912) 132-135 suggested Eve's inscription was the trace of a hymn which had inspired these works. Meiss (as in nt. 40) argued the source was Dante, Paradiso, canto XXXII, where Mary's court is described as a Mystic Rose where Bernard sings her praises and Eve lies at her feet. In the poem, however, many of Mary's attendants are women, and it is unlikely that the Commedia would have been so well known to the Cistercians by c. 1335-1340: Francesco di Pretoro, La Divina Commedia nelle sue vicende attraverso i secoli (Florence, 1965); Michael Caesar, ed., Dante: the Critical Heritage, 1314(?)–1870 (London and New York, 1989). Yet there is in fact one mid-Quattrocento miniature from the Divine Comedy, done by the Sienese artist Giovanni di Paolo (fig. 83), in which Eve is shown under the Virgin's feet in the Heavenly Rose: see the Appendix.

⁷⁶Caroline Walker Bynum, Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages (Berkeley, 1982) 110-169.

⁷⁷Barré 18 suggests this increasing allegorising of Eve as the flesh, the senses, or sometimes the lower powers is one of the most notable features of medieval writings on Mary and Eve. See Chapter One for a more thorough discussion of this theme.

Mary's painted cloister here.⁷⁸ One of William of St-Thierry's (c. 1065-1148) tracts is a good example, especially since it was intended as a spur to meditation for his fellow monks: it begins with a prayer for God's mercy, and then passes to the reasons why the monk has sinned. But here William's cloister is Eden, and Eve his failing flesh:

Nam cum in paradiso tuo olim me creasses, ipsumque lignum vitae in possessionem mihi iuris perpetui donasses, voluisti vel permisisti ut etiam ad fructum ligni scientiae boni et mali manu mitterem, ut quasi bonorum meorum interiorum pertaesus, experirer quid foris possem, Eva mea, carne mea in hoc consentiente... formeraueras me ad imaginem et similitudinem tuam, et locaueras in paradiso uoluptatis tuae, ut operarer et custodirem illum, operarer bonorum studiorum exercitiis, custodirem ne serpens irreperet. Serpens irrepsit, Evam meam seduxit, et per eam praevaricationem me constituit.⁷⁹

Having made this admission, the passage ends with a plea to be protected against further attacks of weakness. The linking of Eve, flesh, and monkish weakness is not unlike that of the Salve, and it seems possible that related notions might inform the Maestà lunette, at least for worshippers familiar with such Cistercian sources.

This would mean, above all, the Cistercians themselves, and it seems likely that they were the primary intended audience of these frescoes. We have already seen the images assume an audience familiar enough with the history of Cistercian S. Galgano to identify and interpret the figures of the lunettes, and to understand the conflation of Galgano's vision with an idealised Cistercian court of Mary. The paintings also assume an understanding of why Mary might be represented alone as a queen, and an ability to identify the

⁷⁸For a fourteenth-century Franciscan cloister-paradise: Wenzel 684-685.

⁷⁹William of St. Thierry, "Oraison IV" *Oraisons méditatives*, ed. Jacques Hourlier (Paris, 1985) 79-87, 82-83.

rather unusual personifications of Rule flanking Benedict and Bernard. These are particular and sophisticated demands, and point to the Cistercians themselves as creators of the iconography and programme. Such an audience might well be disposed to include Eve as a way of increasing Mary's honour, and to see Eve as a kind of allegory of their own state. In fact, Eve's own portrayal may suggest she was at least semi-allegorical in initial conception, reinforcing her links to the personifications of Rule who flank her: a very similar figure could be used by Lorenzetti as a personification of Peace in the Palazzo Pubblico, with only minor alterations.

Not that Trecento Cistercians were especially erudite or devoted to scholastic pursuits, especially in Italy, despite the Cistercian Pope Benedict XII's attempted reforms in the late 1330s, and the occasionally large libraries they had acquired.⁸⁰ But they were specialists in their own Order and its history, and they may even have been relatively skilled as interpreters of allegories: in their cloisters, early Cistercians listened to sermons such as Bernard's De tre filiabus regis, elaborate tales of monastic virtues personified as daughters of God the King.⁸¹ And the monks of S. Galgano had an elaborate exegesis of the landscape of the saint's own vision, where the river he crossed was faith, the rushing mill hope, and the bridge "dilecto Dei et proximi!"⁸² Such habits of interpretation were more widespread than is usually

⁸⁰On the reforms, and fourteenth-century Cistercian learning: Jean-Berthold Mahn, Le Pape Benoît XII et les Cisterciens (Paris, 1949); for their libraries: David N. Bell, The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines, and Premonstratensians (London, 1992). In 1262 a number of law books were bequeathed to San Galgano, but nothing else is known about the library: Canestrelli Document XVIII, 125-126.

⁸¹Bernard of Clairvaux, "Parabolae" Opera VI-2, 257-303.

⁸²"Pons iste, qui timorem transeuntibus incutit t(r)emulentum, ad minus duobus pedibus in altum erigitur per effectum, utramque partem fluminis potenter adcingens, per quos dilectio Dei et proximi veraciter figurantur. Igitur per fluvium fidem, per molendinum spem, per pontem caritatem recipere non timemus." *Vita Sancti Galgani* 189.

acknowledged in fourteenth-century Central Italy, and may even have encouraged Eve's inclusion - as potential personification of forgivable human weakness? - in the first place.⁸³

But the most compelling evidence for this Cistercian viewership lies in the creation and patronage of the chapel itself, and to conclude, I would like to suggest the shadowy patron of the chapel (fig. 31) could himself have been a member of Cistercian S. Galgano, and thus fully receptive to these themes.

V. Patronage, Vanni Salimbeni, and Ristoro della Selvatella

In general, two types of person made bequests to S. Galgano. The first was the citizen of Siena, often a noble with property or ties in the region;⁸⁴ the second was the local person, born and bred in the shadow of the abbey.⁸⁵ There have in fact been two suggestions for the patronage of the Lorenzetti chapel, and together they represent both categories.

⁸³Hans Belting, "The New Role of Narrative in Public Painting of the Trecento: *Historia* and Allegory" Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Studies in the History of Art, vol 16. (Washington DC, 1985) 151-168; more generally: Carolyn Van Dyke, The Fiction of Truth: Structures of Meaning in Narrative and Dramatic Allegory (Ithaca and London, 1985); Rosamund Tuve, Allegorical Imagery: Some Medieval Books and Their Posterity (Princeton, NJ, 1966); Angus Fletcher, Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode (Ithaca, 1964).

⁸⁴For example, the "nobilis et sapiens Vir miles dominus Blasius q. domini Tolomei," who in 1299 left various bequests that would fall to San Galgano if they were not carried out according to his wishes: Siena, Archivio Diplomatico 1298i, 22. More humble Siennese also made bequests: in 1284 a clothier named Bartolomeo di Ildebrando asked to be buried either at S. Galgano or at the church of the Umiliati; a merchant, Andrea di Giacomo, left the huge sum of 1800 Siennese lire in 1274: Canestrelli 72-73.

⁸⁵At least one person from Chiusdino, Galgano's birthplace, was buried at S. Galgano, while many local people left bequests for masses or the monastery works: in 1332, for example, Muccia di Turino of Chiusdino left 10 pounds to the monastery, and in 1335 Lasgia di Barthalino of Boccheggiano left 5 soldi "sacristie S. Galgani pro missis." See: Rolf Bagemihl, "Painting and Sculpture in the Diocese of Volterra: A Documentary Investigation (1300-1400)," Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1993, 34, 240, 241.

The first suggestion rests on a will now in the State Archives of Siena, drawn up on 1 June, 1340, for Vanni "Forgia," son of the late Lord Tofo, of the Salimbeni of Siena, the most powerful family in Trecento Siena.⁸⁶ Vanni stipulated he was to be buried in the family tomb in S. Francesco, but that revenue from his farm at San Pietro, Chiusdino, was to be used to build "*iuxta ecclesiam Sancti Galgani una pulcerrima cappella de lapidibus bene conciis et cum voltis et bene picta.*" One of the monks was to be appointed to celebrate masses in perpetuity, recommending Vanni's soul and that of his deceased son Neri to God, Mary, Galgano, and the whole celestial court, with four measures of grain per annum from Vanni's farm as a stipend; Vanni's grandson Giovanni was named his universal heir.⁸⁷

Vanni's will is a very good possibility for the commission of the chapel, and has been universally supported since Eve Borsook argued a hand associated with the Lorenzetti shop in the 1340s was visible in the fresco images.⁸⁸ More recently, Diana Norman has suggested a powerful Siennese patron such as Vanni Salimbeni would explain the choice of such a powerful Siennese artist; the mid-1340s date would explain why so much was left to the workshop, as Lorenzetti was very busy in these years; she also proposed, as had Borsook, that the prominent position of the Baptist and the Evangelist might be due to their role as the patron's namesakes, since Vanni is a shortened form of Giovanni, and she claimed "*Misericordia*" once held wheat,

⁸⁶Franco Salimei, *I Salimbeni di Siena* (Rome, 1986); Albero II gives Vanni Forgia's genealogy.

⁸⁷ASS, Archivio Diplomatico Generale 830, 1 giugno 1340, c. 1. The will exists in a shorter and a longer version, drawn up on the same day; the longer version makes arrangements in case Vanni's grandson should predecease him, and adds some details about the funeral arrangements. The shorter will is transcribed as an appendix to Schmidt, 295-296.

⁸⁸Borsook 33-34.

in honour of the income from Vanni's farm.⁸⁹ It is also true no other chapel at S. Galgano seems to fit the description of the will: although there was a vaulted chapel in the upper storey of the fourteenth-century cemetery chapel, it has no trace of frescoes, and has traditionally been linked to the Pannochieschi or the Counts of Elci.⁹⁰

Yet there are several possible objections to Vanni's patronage. I am not convinced by several of Norman's arguments: "Active Charity" is not holding wheat, for instance, and John the Baptist and John the Evangelist are commonly included among the four standing saints of Sienese Majesties, a point Norman herself admitted; they would therefore have seemed natural inclusions for both Lorenzetti and the predominantly Sienese monks of the abbey. Also, given Vanni's wish to have his son commemorated, it is odd Neri's patron saint, the bishop Ranieri, is not prominently included in the *Maestà*.⁹¹ Moreover, even assuming Vanni died almost immediately after making his will, that the bequest was passed on very quickly and the vaulted chapel built in record time, the frescoes could still not be dated much before the mid-1340s; this would place them very late in Lorenzetti's work, close to his 1344 Annunciation, done for the Office of the Biccherna while the monk Francesco of S. Galgano was in fact the Treasurer - and stylistically the works are very dissimilar.⁹² But the most basic objection, perhaps, is that it seems

⁸⁹Norman (1993) 289-300, who also noted Vanni had acted at least once as proeditore della Biccherna, and might therefore know the monks of S. Galgano, who were often the city's treasurers.

⁹⁰Canestrelli 73-74; according to Rolf Bogemihl, "A Sienese Gradual at Pomarance and the Early Tuscan Renaissance" GdBA 139 (1997) 19-36, 35 nt. 46: in 1394, one Niccolò di Muccio of Belforte chose burial "apud ecclesiam Sct. Gli. ordinis cisterciensis...inferius ad tumulum seu avellum comitum de Ilcie."

⁹¹For Raynerius of Pisa, normally shown as a hermit or pilgrim: Kaftal (1952) 873-884.

⁹²For the work: Torriti 124-125.

unlikely the figure of such a prominent donor should have been added as an afterthought, uneasily inserted, as we have seen, on Gabriel's hems.

The second patronage suggestion originates with a 1645 description of the chapel by a former abbot of S. Galgano, Antonio Libanori:

Anche nella Sagrestia della Cappella sul MonteSiepi vi è un'Altare, nella cui tavola a oro vi è dipinto un Crocifisso, l'Angelo Michele, e S. Galgano, e nel gradino di lei alcuni degli Apostoli. Serve questa Tavola al di dietro per Armario di riporvi i paramenti dell'Altare, e Messa, e'l Quadro di mezzo si apre verso la porta, e vi è dipinto l'Immagine della Regina del Cielo con Giesù nelle braccia, pittura molto bella, antica, e divota. Questa Tavola, e Sagrestia a spese proprie fece fare un tale da Selvatella, come dimostrano le seguenti parole a oro poste nella Cornice del Crocifisso di mezzo:

Questa Tavola, con la Cappella fece fare
Ristoro da Selvatella, MCCCXXXVI.

La pittura, che è assai bella, e molto artificiosa, fù d'un tale, che vi pose il suo nome nel gradino della Tavola:

Nicolaus Segre me pinxit.⁹³

In many ways, this Counter-Reformation abbot is a dubious witness, and the first modern historian of S. Galgano cautioned there was no other mention of this Ristoro in any of its surviving records, and that the date of 1336 was not documented anywhere else.⁹⁴ Yet there is some evidence to support Libanori's

⁹³ Antonio Libanori, *Vita del Glorioso San Galgano eremita cisterciense* (Siena, 1645) 130.

⁹⁴ Libanori's claim there were earlier frescoes in the Rotunda was probably a mis-interpretation of Gregorio Lombardelli, *Vita del gloriosissimo S. Galgano senese di Chiusdino* (Siena, 1577) 108-110. Lombardelli mentions that because of the great devotion to the saint, "de miracoli, da Idio concessi a' meriti d'esso furon dipinte le mura, e le tavole, come anco ne furno espressi in cera, e in diverse misture; benché hoggi giorno solamente una parte de' dipinti se scorge." He then lists Galgano's miracles, without specifying whether they were represented or not, and in each case includes a verse from the saint's office. Libanori 107-112 claimed these same miracles had once been painted, and gave the same verses from Galgano's office as inscriptions under the painted scenes: Libanori 107-112. Similarly, his partial description (p. 131) of the frescoes is also dubious: "In questa Sagrestia fra l'altre pitture, che rimangono nel muro, vi si vede il Cardinale Stefano di Ceccano inginocchiato d'avanti la santiss. Nunziata, e più alto trà gli BB. Giacomo da Montieri, e Raniero da Belforte, Monaci del Monastero nostro di San Galgano, Lucio III che Canonizò il Santo, i Vescovi, Ugo Saladini, Ildebrando Ponocchi, e Galgano Visconti, se pure avvisiamo bene, poiche nissuna inscrizione vi si vede." For the impossibilities

claim. In the 1930s, Peleo Bacci published a Madonna and Child on panel from the Rotunda.⁹⁵ It was very damaged, but clearly had once been hinged, and Bacci attributed it to Niccolò di Segna, a Sienese artist documented in 1331 and 1345; he therefore argued the panel was the only remaining trace of the cupboard-altarpiece described by Libanori, and that the abbot had no doubt misread the Latin Segne as Segre.⁹⁶ This panel was unfortunately stolen in 1968, and obviously there is no evidence it originally was commissioned for the chapel, but its reported dimensions would have fitted very well into the frescoed chapel as it was executed.⁹⁷

There is also some support for the 1336 date recorded by Libanori. In 1977, Alison Luchs discovered a document drawn up at S. Galgano on August 15, 1334, in which Ambrogio Lorenzetti acted as a witness; Luchs noted that the hand of a painter known to have been in Lorenzetti's shop c.1330-1335 had been identified at Montesiepi by Borsook, and it was therefore possible the paintings had been done between 1334 and 1336.⁹⁸ This earlier date also

of this description: Borsook 12-13, 24-25; and for the lack of corroborating evidence of Ristoro: Canestrelli 74 nt.1.

⁹⁵Peleo Bacci, "Identificazione e restauro della tavola del 1336 di Niccolò di Segna di Siena" *Bollettino d'arte* 29 (1935-36) 1-13.

⁹⁶For Niccolò, also mentioned in a document of 1331 and who left a crucifix dated 1345: Henk van Os, "Possible Additions to the Work of Niccolò di Segna" *Studies in Early Tuscan Painting* (London, 1992) 289-299; *Gotico a Siena* 92-94; Gertrude Coor, "A Painting of St. Lucy in the Walters Art Gallery and Some Closely Related Representations" *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 18 (1955) 79-90.

⁹⁷The Madonna panel in its damaged frame was 1.02 m tall and 0.74 m wide, and it might be assumed the two saints, Michael and Galgano, stood on either side. If they were each fully half the width of the centre panel, the total width might be estimated at 1.48 m. To give some idea of scale, the current altar is 1.71 m wide, which would leave more than ten centimeters clearance on each side; it is 1.08 m deep, and 1.04 m tall. Even with a fairly high predella, the 1.02 m height recorded by Brogi could have sat comfortably on a comparable altar, without obscuring the Annunciation, which according to Borsook begins 2.41 m above the floor. For the measurements, Brogi 128-129; Borsook 10; the altar measurements are my own.

⁹⁸Alison Luchs, "Ambrogio Lorenzetti at Montesiepi" *BM* 119 (1977) 186-187. The document (Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Archivio Diplomatico, Cestello, 15 Agosto 1334) was drawn up

brings the frescoes closer to Lorenzetti's similar Maestà lunettes in Sant'Agostino, Siena, and in Massa Maritima (fig. 35), both dated between c.1335 and 1338.⁹⁹ The principal problem remained, however, that no trace had ever been found of the putative donor, Ristoro da Selvatella.

I have now discovered him. In fact, despite Canestrelli's assertion, Ristoro features prominently in a group of documents in the Caleffi of S. Galgano, transcribed, as mentioned, around 1319. The first mention comes in January 1282 (1283 modern style), when one "Ristorus quondam orlandi de gallena volens deo et gloriose virgini marie et beato galgano confessori reddere vota sua," took a vow of "castitatem seu continentiam;" he was received by the subprior, in place of the abbot, and pledged to donate himself and all his goods, past and future, to the monastery of S. Galgano, retaining them in usufruct for his lifetime.¹⁰⁰ The identification is confirmed by the next mention, in 1293, when a monk of the abbey was ordered to oversee the transfer of a property to "Ristoro ...oblato sive appodiato dci. monasteri;" this property is described as a "podere dicti monasterii positum in curte mençani quod dictus et vocatus (est) podere de Selvatella," hence Ristoro's nickname.¹⁰¹ Selvatella is perhaps to be identified with La Selva which lies

in the cloister of S. Galgano, and the witnesses were three monks and "Ambroxio de Senis pictore." Borsook 27, 33, identified the hand of a Lorenzetti assistant known to be active in the shop c.1330-35, but chose a date between 1342-44.

⁹⁹Norman (1995); Max Seidel, "Die Fresken des Ambrogio Lorenzetti in S. Agostino" MKIF 22 (1978) 185-252. More tentatively, the postures of the Madonna and Child in the second version of the Maestà are similar to those of the Niccolò di Segna altarpiece; it is possible the panel was used as a model for the change, although by no means conclusive. And the "Ave Maria" reported on the frame by Brogi 128, although a common inclusion in the Trecento, would make sense with the Annunciation shown above.

¹⁰⁰The references to Ristoro can be found in the second of the three Caleffi record books: Conventi, Filza 162, folios 299r-300v, 307r-314r. His vows and the transfer of his property are recorded as two separate documents on 312r and 312v. Ironically, Canestrelli, the first to claim Ristoro couldn't be found in the Caleffi, lists his name among the property sales and transfers he compiled around Mensano: Canestrelli 34.

near Gallena and Mensano (see Map II); all of these are a few kilometers north of Montesiepi, making Ristoro a local man.¹⁰²

It seems unlikely, however, that Ristoro was a fully professed monk. Although when making his vows he is accepted as "fratrem et oblatum" of the community, elsewhere in the Caleffi documents he is variously termed "conversus," "oblatus sive appodiatu," or "oblato sive appoggiato."¹⁰³ This confusion is significant, suggesting a rather uncertain status, and in fact, the description of Ristoro's vows suggests he was a lay associate of S. Galgano, a familiaris, rather than a full monk or converso (a professed lay-brother). This type of lay religious vocation is still very little understood, and as such Ristoro's precise link to S. Galgano is likely to remain somewhat shadowy, but certain aspects are clear.¹⁰⁴ Such people came from diverse backgrounds, and normally took rudimentary vows, pledging to donate their worldly goods to the community but retaining usufruct of them while they lived; they were expected to lead a fairly austere life, but had the right to the abbey's protection

¹⁰¹The ten-year gap between the vows and the conferring of the Selvatella is slightly puzzling, and perhaps it is possible that when the documents were transcribed c. 1319-1321, 1282/3 was a transcription error for 1292/3. It may be significant that the subprior was a Peter in both years, and that the same notary, Bartolomeus quondam Bonaventure, recorded the documents, despite the ten-year gap of the dates. It is clear, however, that 1293/4 was not an error for 1283/4, since Abbot Ranieri, mentioned in the property transfer, is documented 1288-1295: Canestrelli Document IV, 112-113.

¹⁰²Gallena was a small village; Mensano was a larger town originally subject to Volterra, which swore loyalty to Siena in 1227: I Castelli del senese. Strutture fortificate dell'area senese-grossetana, 2 vols (Siena, 1976) I, 292. It is possible Selvatella lay near La Selva, located south of Mensano: Maria Ginatempo, Crisi di un territorio: Il popolamento della Toscana senese alla fine del Medioevo (Florence, 1988) 124 nt. 136, mentions a 1532 tax document which recorded "Castel della Selva" with Mensano, Monteriggioni, Chiusdino and other nearby towns.

¹⁰³Conventi 162, 312v (1298); 299r (1306); 311r (1301).

¹⁰⁴For "familiares:" Jacques Hourlier, Les religieux: Histoire du Droit et des Institutions de l'Eglise en Occident X: L'âge classique (1140-1378) (Cujas, 1974) 266-268; for a specific study: Lorenzo Tacchella, I 'Donati' nella storia del sovrano militare ordine di Malta (Verona, 1986).

and to burial within its grounds, and in some cases they also lived at the community's expense, which could make such a choice attractive choice for the poor. In the Cistercian order this status was regulated by their Codifications: familiars were to renounce all their goods, and to take vows of continence and obedience (presumably Ristoro's "castitatem seu continentiam") "in manu abbatis;" they then received the familiar's tonsure and habit.¹⁰⁵ This description obviously applies fairly well to the account of Ristoro's vows, and there seem to have been other familiars at S. Galgano.¹⁰⁶ None of them, however, is documented as extensively as Ristoro in the community's records; he can be traced until the end of 1316, acting as "sindicus" and sometimes "procurator" of the community, carefully acquiring properties totaling several hundred pounds around Mensano, Gallena, and the Selvatella; this was in addition to his own possibly considerable holdings, which would also pass to S. Galgano at his death.¹⁰⁷

Thus Ristoro's involvement with S. Galgano was far more profound than that of Vanni Salimbeni: he had chosen to devote his life to the service of the abbey and its patrons, and would be buried there at his death. It is

¹⁰⁵Lucet (as in nt. 25) 320: "Ad communionem bonorum temporalium nulli familiares recipiantur nisi qui ad abrenuntiationem proprietatis, votum continentie et obedientiam se voluerint obligare in manu abbatis, tonsuram et habitum familiaribus deputatum quamdiu vixerint portaturi. Si qui vero habitum familiaris in aliqua domorum nostrarum susceperint, in aliis domibus non recipiantur nisi de licentia proprii abbatis."

¹⁰⁶Canestrelli 30-32 records other "oblates:" Guidalotta del fu Ugucione della Bella donated a house among her possessions; Arrigo di Finguerra and his wife Sorrentina donated all their goods in 1274-1275; Tavante di Ottaviano did the same in 1278. It is true that in the first Caleffo there are references to a Ristoro Monachus in 1288 and 1296 and a Ristoro Priore and procuratore in 1298, but his name does not make clear this is the same man: Conventi 161, 102v-103v; 458v-459r. Two Ristoros might also explain why the one in question here is invariably identified by his patronimic and often nickname.

¹⁰⁷The selling price of these plots varied from 290 Sienese pounds (August, 1301; 311v-312r) to 10 pounds (May 1298, 312v-313r); the total value would be more than 500 pounds. Ristoro's own properties do not seem to be recorded, but in 1314 he was able to pay a servant 15 pounds for a year's service (December, 1314; 314r).

therefore possible the Montesiepi chapel was created between 1334 and 1336, in part as Ristoro's burial place, perhaps more than a decade after his death, and that the images were created by and for the Cistercians themselves, through the actions and bequests of a man who had willingly dedicated his life to S. Galgano's service.¹⁰⁸ Obviously none of this is proven; the 1336 panel and chapel might originally have been at the Selvatella itself, or elsewhere, and the altarpiece only moved to Montesiepi at some much later date.¹⁰⁹ But the late inclusion of such a donor seems less surprising: it might have seemed the chapel had been created by one of S. Galgano's own, with no initial need of commemoration. Furthermore, for someone like Ristoro della Selvatella, intimately familiar with the Cistercians, their ideals, and even the particular history of S. Galgano, the particular demands made by the frescoes of their viewers might have been not only fitting, but almost second nature; and the wish to honour Mary by novel means an appropriate, even laudable, goal.

VI. Conclusions

Thus this first surviving instance of Mary with Eve at her feet seems to have been intended for a limited and exclusively male audience, the monks of S. Galgano. And even if they were not necessarily learned theologians, they

¹⁰⁸Ristoro's death is not recorded in the Caleffi, but had he died prior to their 1319-21 transcription, some reference to the properties he acquired having passed to the abbey might be expected. This may suggest he was not dead when they were transcribed, despite the fact he is not recorded after 1316.

¹⁰⁹Canestrelli 31 records the intriguing case of one Giacomo del fu Enrico di Giliotto Incontri, who was required to build an oratory on the lands he donated, which he retained in usufruct until his death. This bequest was confirmed in wills of 1298 and 1303, and became the oratory of Sta. Margherita or S. Galganello, consecrated in 1319. There are obvious similarities to Ristoro's case, as he also was required to build a "domus" at the Selvatella as part of its transfer to him, but no reference to it implies any religious function.

would no doubt have had a more extensive knowledge of Mariological themes than their secular neighbours: Mary was their special advocate, and it seems possible the wish to honour her in this new way should be linked to this heightened devotion: even as novices, the Cistercians learned they might expect special protection from Mary; as they read the miracle stories of Caesarius of Heisterbach (c. 1180-c. 1240), they found she had even shown the Pope himself they were under her special care. This story concluded with the comment: "I do not wonder that so mighty a queen should defend those whose advocacy she undertakes," a statement no less flattering or reassuring than the Maestà image might be.¹¹⁰ But this was also a reminder of the necessity of obedience and humility within the Cistercian community: Eve's inclusion could also serve as a reminder of their own inherited weakness and their need for the Virgin's protection. Even Mary could not guarantee the Cistercian supplicant automatic entry to her court: he might still be undone by the disobedience of sin, and to ask for Mary's mercy he must do so from his position as co-sinner with Eve. He could be certain, however, that Mary would help him, as she had helped Eve, for as Bernard himself had stressed:

Laetare, pater Adam, sed magis tu, o Eva mater,
exsulta....Ambo, inquam, consolamini super filia, et tali
filia;...curre, Eva, ad Mariam; curre, mater, ad filiam; filia pro
matre resondeat, ipsa matris opprobrium auferat, ipsa patri pro
matre satisfaciat, quia ecce si vir cecidit per feminam, iam non
erigitur nisi per feminam.¹¹¹

And if this was the burial chapel of one of their number, the pairing of Eve and Mary takes on a new tone: the certainty of sin and death sweetened by the

¹¹⁰Caesarius of Heisterbach, *The Dialogue on Miracles*, 2 vols, trans. H. von E. Scott and C.C. Swinton (London, 1929) I, 460-462.

¹¹¹Bernard of Clairvaux, "In Laudibus Virginis Matris" *Opera* IV, 22-23.

promised possibility of salvation and resurrection, and the chance to join the perfect Cistercian court.

In fact, the Eve at Cistercian Montesiepi was repeated, with slight variations, over and over in the Trecento and early Quattrocento, suggesting the success of this new imagery: the figures at Montefalco (1340s, figs. 37, 42) and S. Severino Marche (c. 1400, fig. 67) are especially close. Yet none of the other images of Mary with Eve at her feet is known to come from a Cistercian community: after all, many of these were in decline in the later fourteenth-century, and their relatively isolated position could make them uniquely vulnerable; S. Galgano itself was repeatedly terrorised by the great mercenary companies, and in 1397 only the abbot was still resident and selling off property.¹¹² It is unlikely, therefore, that the iconography spread because it was being promulgated by the Cistercians, or because it was being seen at S. Galgano. There are other possibilities: there may have been a lost copy or a model that was known to artists around the Lorenzetti shop, including for example Lippo Vanni, whose 1358 use of the iconography will feature in the last case study of this thesis (fig. 68). Or it might have been known by verbal description.

But our discounted patron, Vanni detto Forgia Salimbeni, might also offer a fruitful line of inquiry. The Salimbeni family's great wealth came primarily from banking, and less from trade, but its members behaved like aristocrats; the main family property, now the seat of the Monte dei Paschi bank, was a huge fortified palace, where they hosted princes, kings, and emperors. Much of the Salimbeni prestige rested on the (supposed) antiquity of the line, their vast territorial holdings and strongholds beyond the city, and

¹¹²Canestrelli 20-21; in 1366 the Company of St. George even occupied the abbey itself.

perhaps especially on heroic qualities of the male members: military adventures are a leitmotif of the family history, and Vanni's father, grandson, and several of his great-grandsons were full cavalieri, sharing that status with Galgano himself.¹¹³ In fact, Vanni's will is a clear reflection of his dual persona: his body was to rest in S. Francesco, a church patronised by his family, but Vanni was also the signore of Boccheggiano, a castello very near Galgano's birthplace, Chiusdino (Map II); and in 1340, when he made his bequest to the abbey, his extended family controlled much of the surrounding countryside.¹¹⁴ His great-uncle had in fact served as podestà of Galgano's birthplace, Chiusdino, in 1289, as S. Galgano's own records show; and most importantly, although this has not been noticed before, Vanni's own association with the monastery seems to have been of long standing: in 1316, more than twenty years before he dictated his will, he had acted as a witness for the abbey to a sale of property, drawn up in Siena.¹¹⁵ If, despite arguments to the contrary, Vanni rather than Ristoro della Selvatella was in fact the patron of the S. Galgano frescoes, are later images of Mary with Eve at her feet related in any way to the concerns of patrons like him?

This question will return in later chapters, but before addressing it in more detail, I would like to explore more fully one of the most complex and important aspects of the Montesiepi imagery, Mary's queenship as the Second Eve, by examining a group of other images where, as at Montesiepi, Mary's rule of heaven is the dominant element.

¹¹³Salimei 15-16, 52, 259-260.

¹¹⁴The Salimbeni controlled most of the territory of the Val d'Orcia to Chiusi, the Valle dell'Ombrone and the Sienese Maremma, including the area around S. Galgano; family members were signori or conti of S. Giovanni d'Asso, Castello della Selva (!), Vignone, Chiarentana, La Briccola, Montorsaio, and others: Salimei 163-164, and genealogical trees.

¹¹⁵ASS Conventi 161, 431r-432, (January, 1288/89); and Conventi 163, 321r,v.

CHAPTER THREE

QUEEN OF HEAVEN: MONTEFALCO, PISA, AND CLEVELAND

Per gli peccaturi canpare,
foste facta voi regina,
percio vo piaccia de pregare
per la gente si taipina
-Laudario dei Disciplinati di Assisi (fourteenth-century)¹

In the *Maestà* of Montesiepi (fig. 12), Mary was originally shown with crown, orb, and wand of office, enthroned as Queen of the Cistercians and Queen of Heaven. This was certainly the most unambiguous image of Mary as a ruler among those images where Eve was included at her feet, but the Virgin is also crowned in a 1371 fresco in Magione (fig. 49), and in panels now in Altenburg (1370s, fig. 88) and Cleveland (c. 1400, fig. 1). And her coronation itself is pictured in both Montefalco (1340s, fig. 37) and Pisa (1390, fig. 47). This is a small but significant group, and suggests Mary's queenship and her role as the Second Eve were somehow linked for Trecento and early Quattrocento Christians.

This chapter is intended to explore this link, and the implications of this iconography. To pursue this goal, however, its structure is slightly different from that of the other case studies. Rather than a close analysis of a particular painting and context of interpretation, it will examine three different works, all linked by their emphasis on Mary's heavenly rule; two of these are entirely undocumented, and two are in ruinous condition, but this will not prevent general conclusions being drawn about Mary's queenship within them. The chapter begins with the Coronations of Montefalco and Pisa, before turning to the Cleveland panel's image of Mary as the Woman of the

¹Franco Mancini, ed., *Il Laudario "Frondini" dei Disciplinati di Assisi (sec. XIV)* (Florence, 1990) "Lauda Iuditij" 201-212, 207-209.

Apocalypse; it will be argued these three images were understood in relation to the teachings of the most important Marian feast, the Assumption, which celebrated Mary's ascent into Paradise and her continuing presence with Christ in Heaven. Crucially, for fourteenth-century Christians, the Virgin's unique freedom from bodily death, the inheritance of Original Sin, permitted her to intercede with Christ on their behalf, allowing them to hope they might follow her at the moment of the Last Judgment. Yet because Mary was also seen as a type of the Church, images of her rule could have more earthly implications: the Coronation of Mary was also an assertion of the triumph of orthodoxy and the Church, as we shall see.

I. The Frescoes at Montefalco and Pisa

The first painting to be considered is the large Coronation of the Virgin found in Sant'Agostino in Montefalco (fig. 37). As its name implies, this church belonged to the Augustinian Friars, a Mendicant Order created in 1256 from a union of pre-existing groups of hermits (including Galgano's original followers) under the Rule of St. Augustine.² The community at Sant'Agostino was founded in 1275, when the Commune of Montefalco gave the Hermits a church dedicated to John the Baptist.³ The friars rededicated the

²David Gutiérrez, *Los Agustinos en la edad media 1256-1356* (Rome, 1980); F. Roth, "Cardinal Richard Annibaldi First Protector of the Augustinian Order 1243-1276" *Augustiniana* 2 (1952) 26-60; B. van Luijk, *Bullarium Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini, periodus formationis 1187-1256* (Wurzburg, 1964). There had in fact been an earlier union of hermits in 1244, incorporated into the 1256 order. See Map I for the locations of towns and frescoes discussed here and elsewhere in the chapter.

³For S. Agostino: Pietro Bellini, "Il movimento agostiniano in Umbria nel secolo XIII" *La Spiritualità di S. Chiara da Montefalco: Atti del I Convegno di studio, Montefalco, 8-10 agosto 1985*, ed. Silvestro Nessi. (Montefalco, 1987) 69-95; Silvestro Nessi, *Le origini del comune di Montefalco* (Spoleto, 1977) 74, nt. 163. For Montefalco in general: Giovanna Chiuini, "Montefalco" *Storia dell'arte italiana III/i* 197-231.

church to include their patron, Augustine, and substantially rebuilt it in the 1270s and 1280s, adding the conventual buildings; in 1327 a wide nave aisle was added on the south side, almost doubling the size of the church.⁴ The relatively ambitious scale of the friary perhaps reflected Augustinian preeminence among the mendicant foundations in the town at the time, for in addition to their own community, the friars had numerous smaller convents under their jurisdiction, including that of S. Croce, the convent of Claire of Montefalco.⁵

Like almost every other Trecento artwork or building in Montefalco, the Coronation fresco is completely undocumented;⁶ it is also badly damaged and has been heavily restored, especially at the bottom, making interpretation of the details quite difficult.⁷ But it has been always been related to the Lorenzetti circle, and is considered Sienese, from perhaps the mid-1340s, making it the earliest Mary/Eve work after Montesiepi, although it should be

⁴Chiuini 208, 210.

⁵Chiuini 208-210. For Claire, in addition to *La Spiritualità di Chiara*, see: Claudio Leonardi and Enrico Menesto, eds. *S. Chiara da Montefalco e il suo tempo: Atti del quarto Convegno di studi storici ecclesiastici* (Perugia and Florence, 1985); Silvestro Nessi, ed., *Chiara da Montefalco Badessa del Monastero di S. Croce: Le sue testimonianze, i suoi 'dicti'* (Montefalco, 1981).

⁶According to Dillian Rosalind Gordon, "Art in Umbria c. 1250-1350," Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1979, 289-290, only one painter can be securely documented in Montefalco in this period, a "Magister Matteo Elimosine de Perusio et nunc habitatori Assisii," listed in November 1338 and January 1339. Even this may be uncertain: she gives as her source "Rome, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Introitus et Exitus, 173, Benedicti XII. *Montis Flasconensis* Fortii Aedificatio, anno 1338-39, ff. 39r, 44v, 50r," which would seem to refer to Montefiascone, not Montefalco.

⁷The church is currently closed for restorations under the supervision of Germana Aprato, Director of the Soprintendenza in Perugia; this is the most recent of a series of campaigns documented in the files of the Archivio storico of the Soprintendenza per i beni artistici dell'Umbria in Perugia, As(C) 11.5b, 11.3, 11. 4-5c, and Misc. 37A, which unfortunately do not explicitly record the heavy intervention in the Coronation fresco.

stressed that this date is based more on the dating of the S. Galgano frescoes than on considerations of style.⁸

The fresco is found close to the entry on the north nave wall (fig. 37). It is a large square (307 x app. 420 cm) with a frame of ornamental bands, giving it the appearance of a huge miniature. Christ and Mary are enthroned at the centre on a plain bench (fig 38); He places a tiara crown on her head, and she bows slightly and crosses her hands on her breast. They are flanked by two saints on each side: at their proper right (fig 39) is a bishop in a black, cowled Augustinian habit, presumably Augustine himself, and a white-haired saint holding a bird against his chest, probably John the Evangelist with the eagle. At the other side (fig. 40) is another bishop, a bearded and white-haired old man; he wears a mitre and cope over what might be a habit, and appears to hold a small bottle, ewer, funnel or trumpet. His identity is uncertain, but he is almost certainly not the priest Fortunato, patron of Montefalco, who might have seemed an obvious choice.⁹ The last saint is John the Baptist, whose position mirrors that of Augustine, as the second patron of the church. There are angels all around the throne: at the front are four with long trumpets, and four more who appear to be holding two lutes, a portable organ, and a viol. Four other angels float beside the throne holding shadowy objects, probably

⁸Carlo Volpe, "Ambrogio Lorenzetti e le congiunzioni fiorentine-senesi nel quarto decennio del Trecento" *Paragone* 13 (1951) 40-52, Berenson (1968) 221; Cesare Brandi, *La regia pinacoteca di Siena* (Rome, 1933) 142-143; Van Marle, "La scuola pittorica orvietana del '300" *Bollettino dell'arte* III (1923-24) 305-335, 320; Guldán 131; Rowley 64, nt. 3; Krautheimer 172, note 7 (as Montefalcone); Van Marle, V, 107; Toesca 672; Grondona 172. Only Grondona ("un anonimo pittore umbro," in the last decades of the Trecento) and Van Marle ("directly inspired by Cola Petruccioli") do not relate the image to the Lorenzetti.

⁹Fortunato is shown elsewhere in Trecento Montefalco, but as a clean-shaven middle-aged priest, not an elderly bishop: Kaftal (1968) 443-444. A possible although perhaps not probable candidate is Prosdocimus of Padua, normally pictured as an elderly bishop with a ewer: Kaftal, *Iconography of the Saints in the Painting of North Eastern Italy* (Florence, 1978) 887-889.

Eve reclines in a deep space in front of Mary and Christ (fig. 42). The figure is obviously dependent on the image at Montesiepi: she is again shown with a fig branch in her right hand and a now-illegible banderole in her left, although this is disposed vertically, not alongside her. She also has the same clinging garment and fur over her shoulders, and the same slightly awkward pose; she may also have the same braided hairstyle, though here topped by a cap.¹⁰ Below her, four more figures appear in the ornamental frame. At the bottom are two donors (figs. 43, 44), apparently both male and in similar dress, although the extent of the losses makes even this uncertain: on the viewer's left it is a blue robe with a tightly-fitted blue cap, and on the right a brown robe and a brown cap. Finally, there are standing figures in painted gothic niches on either side (figs. 45, 46): to the left a haloed woman holding a haloed baby, and to the right a young woman with a crown. It is possible they are linked in some way to the donors nearby; they might be Anne with Mary or Elizabeth with John on the left, and possible Catherine on the right, but although none of these figures would be inappropriate, none can be specifically justified either.¹¹ Donor choice might also be the reason for the inclusion of the mysterious bishop and the Evangelist, although the Evangelist is often paired to the Baptist, and appears in the same central position, flanking the church patron, in another Augustinian image, Ambrogio Lorenzetti's *Maestà* from S. Pietro in Massa Marittima (fig. 35).¹²

¹⁰For Erwin Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (New York, 1972) 152, nt. 1, Eve "recalls the effigies on Etruscan ash urns."

¹¹If the elderly bishop is identified as Prosdocimus of Padua, it is possible the crowned figure might even be Justina of Padua, in whose chapel he was buried: Kaftal (1978) 579-582.

¹²Norman (1995) 492-497. John is also somewhat similar to a figure of philosophy from a fresco from the 1380s in the high altar chapel of Sant'Agostino in Montalcino, though this allegorical figure would seem an odd inclusion here: Freuler (1994) 222-259

The second Coronation fresco to be considered was once located over the entrance to the Aulla Chapel, in the Camposanto at Pisa (fig. 47).¹³

Unusually, in this case we know both painter and date: it was complete when the Orvietan Piero di Puccio was paid for it on March 4, 1391, having also executed several scenes from Genesis elsewhere in the Campo.¹⁴ And even more unusually, this painting is mentioned by Vasari, albeit wrongly ascribed to the Sienese Taddeo di Bartolo, whom, he claims:

da uno de' Lanfranchi, Operaio del duomo, fu chiamato a Pisa, dove trasferitosi...il medesimo Operaio gli fece dipignere in Campo Santo, sopra la capella, una Nostra Donna incoronata da Gesu Cristo, con molti Angeli, in attitudini bellissime e molto ben colorito.¹⁵

If the Montefalco fresco is in poor condition, however, the Pisa painting is almost completely destroyed: only the top third of the fresco survives above what is left of the confused sinopia drawing, a condition that has existed since at least 1787.¹⁶ Consequently, as at Montefalco, it is difficult to interpret many of the details, although again this is not central to our goal.

¹³Antonio Caleca et al., Pisa: Museo delle Sinopie del Camposanto Monumentale (Pisa, 1979) 87; Ugo Procacci, Sinopie e affreschi (Milan, 1961) 237; Camposanto monumentale di Pisa: Affreschi e sinopie (Pisa, 1960) 109-110; Enzo Carli and Paolo E. Arias., Il Camposanto di Pisa (Rome, 1937) 18; Igino Benvenuto Supino, Il Camposanto di Pisa (Florence, 1896) 261-262.

¹⁴In addition to the Pisa cycle, Piero is documented by a 1399 Madonna and Saints in S. Giovenale, Orvieto. See Caleca et al., and: Corrado Fratini, "Percorso nel lungo 'Tracciato orvietano' della pittura medievale (secc. XIII-XIV)" Bollettino dell'Istituto Storico Artistico Orvietano 39 (1983) 169-184; Pier Paolo Donati, "Piero di Puccio: Un breve ciclo di affreschi" Paragone 299 (1975) 18-24; Pier Paolo Donati, "Inediti orvietani del Trecento" Paragone 229 (1969) 3-17; Roberto Longhi, "Tracciato orvietano" Paragone 149 (1962) 3-14; Gnoli (1923) 283-284.

¹⁵Giorgio Vasari, Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori, 9 vols., ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence, 1875-1885) II, 36-37.

¹⁶Procacci 237.

Originally, this Coronation was a very large oblong composition (4.40 x 6.50 m), framed with an ornamental band not unlike the one at Montefalco; small figures with scrolls, presumably prophets, appear within it. At the centre, Christ crowns Mary within an elaborate setting that is half temple, half throne, while three groups of four angels with instruments stand on either side. An inscription records that the fresco was painted in the time of Parasone Grassi, Operaio of the Duomo, presumably the source for Vasari's story of a Lanfranchi operaio calling the painter to Pisa for the work.¹⁷

At the bottom of the throne, the abraded sinopia shows a reclining figure, now headless and apparently naked except for a garment around the hips, with a banderole in the left hand. There is some disagreement about whether this figure represented a nude man, Eve, or someone else, and whether it was executed in fresco or suppressed before the final version of the painting.¹⁸ Eve is certainly the most logical choice, and the heavy curves of the body do not disagree with the Eves painted by Piero di Puccio in the Genesis stories of the same campaign; an inscription near the figure of Eve in the image also suggests such an identification, referring as it must to Mary:MATRE D'OGNI CONCORDIA/ NE LA QUAL INCARNO 'L VERBO VERACE/ IMPERATRICE, DANNE BENE E PACE.¹⁹ And while there is no evidence Piero knew the Montefalco work, the iconography could certainly have been suggested to him or the patron because Piero was creating a Genesis

¹⁷Supino 261-262: EGREGII ET CIRCUMSPECTI VIRI DOMINI PARASONI GRASSI OPERARII OPERE SANCTE MAIORIS...; he reports an earlier writer's transcription: HOC OPUS FACTUM EST TEMPORE EGREGII ET CIRCUMSPECTI VIRI PARASONI GRASSI HONORABILIS PISANE CIVITATIS OPERARII OPERE S. MARIE MAJORIS.

¹⁸Supino 261-262 and Papini 225; Caleca 87 and Procacci 237; Carli and Arias 18 (Eve, suppressed).

¹⁹Supino 261-262.

cycle elsewhere in the Campo, or else because Piero knew the composition from Orvietan colleagues who had used it.²⁰

Thus the Montefalco and the Pisa Coronations are rather different works: the first was executed in a small Umbrian town, while perhaps almost fifty years later the second graced the prestigious burial ground of one of the most important cathedrals in Tuscany. Both of them, however, refer to the moment of Mary's greatest honour: her bodily ascension into Paradise at the moment of her death, and her subsequent coronation as Queen of Heaven. The unique freedom from the consequences of Original Sin was celebrated in the most important Marian feast, the Assumption, and to understand these images, and Eve's role in them, the tradition of this feast now needs to be explored.

II. The Assumption and the Coronation

The Feast of the Assumption is celebrated on August 15. Like the Purification, the Annunciation, and the Nativity of the Virgin, it was adopted from the Eastern Church, and first appeared in the Roman calendar in the seventh century, a symptom of Mary's increasing importance in the Church of that period.²¹

This feast was in fact first known as the Dormition, and originally it celebrated the unique manner of Mary's death. This was not described in the Bible, but from about the fifth century, a whole apocryphal literature

²⁰The 1371 fresco at Magione is attributed to an Orvietan artist, sometimes identified as Andrea di Giovanni, who worked alongside Piero di Puccio's master, Ugolino di Prete Ilario, on the Duomo of the town. The work is discussed in the next chapter.

²¹Jugie 195-196; Coathalem 31ff.

developed to fill the gap.²² The details varied from one tale to the next, but the basic narrative related that Mary was warned of her approaching death, and asked that the Apostles be brought together to her side; when they had all been miraculously assembled, Christ appeared with a host of angels, and carried the soul of his mother to Heaven.²³

But there were conflicting accounts of what then happened to Mary's body: in some sources it was deposited in Eden to await the Last Judgment, while in others Mary's body also ascended.²⁴ In the West, however, the Roman Church tended to emphasise the Virgin's full bodily assumption at the moment of her death; from the beginning, the main purpose of the Assumption feast seems to have been to stress that Mary was present in Heaven and could therefore act as intercessor for those who wished to follow her there.²⁵ The decisive arguments would come in the middle of the ninth century, when the Pseudo-Augustine convincingly argued Mary must have been assumed bodily for at least three reasons. Firstly, Christ would have sought to honour his mother in all things according to the commandment "Honour thy father and thy mother;" therefore he would have saved her from the shame of death and decomposition. Secondly, Christ wished those who followed and served him to be with him, and Mary had followed and served him more than anyone else; therefore her glory should be greater than all others. And thirdly, and most importantly, Mary could not have been subject to Eve's curse, so just as she was freed of the pain and suffering of childbirth she must have been freed of

²²Jugie 103-171.

²³Discussed by Jugie 103-171.

²⁴For two examples among others: Jugie 108-109 and 127-139.

²⁵Jugie 360-361.

death and corruption, the legacy of Original Sin.²⁶ These arguments would settle the debate, although not immediately, but slowly the belief gained ground in the West that Mary was corporeally present in Paradise.²⁷ The way was then open for images of Mary's ascent into Heaven, and her reception by her son, and images of the Virgin's Assumption gradually appeared all over Europe.²⁸

Yet it may not be clear why Mary's Coronation became an image of the feast, especially since there was a notable delay in its appearance: although images of Mary with a crown may have occurred in Rome as early as the sixth century, the first surviving autonomous, large-scale Coronation does not appear until about the mid-twelfth century;²⁹ and the earliest surviving Italian Coronation probably comes as late as the 1270s.³⁰ Before the imagery could develop for the feast, however, a slow shift of exegetical emphasis was needed.

The iconography of the Coronation would draw primarily on two fundamental sources, both used in the liturgy of the Assumption, and both

²⁶Jugie 195-202.

²⁷Jugie 496-500. This is now an article of faith.

²⁸See in general Schiller 140-147; and for Italy: van Os (1990) II, 140-152.

²⁹For crowned Virgins: Marion Lawrence, "Maria Regina" *AB* 7 (1924-25) 150-16; for the Coronation: Thérél; Philippe Verdier, *Le Couronnement de la Vierge: Les origines et les premiers développements d'un thème iconographique* (Montreal and Paris, 1980); Ingrid Flor, "Staats- und kirchenpolitische Aspekte bei mittelalterlichen Marienkrönungsdarstellungen" *Forschungen zur Rechtsarchäologie und Rechtlichen Volkskunde*, ed. Louis Carlen (Zürich, 1990) 59-92; van Os (1990) II, 153-161; Ursula Nilgen, "Maria Regina: Ein politischer Kultbildtypus?" *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 19 (1981) 1-33; Schiller 147-154; Guldan 72-89. Both Verdier 17 and Thérél 205 argue the first monumental Coronation is the tympanum of the parish church at Quenington, c. 1150.

³⁰Gertrude Coor-Achenbach, "The Earliest Italian Representation of the Coronation of the Virgin" *BM* 99 (1957) 328-30; this is a panel attributed to Guido da Siena, in the Courtauld Galleries, London.

concerning the love and marriage of a maiden and a king.³¹ The first is Psalm 44, which speaks of a king, "beautiful above the sons of men," and a queen who stands at his right hand, "in gilded clothing; surrounded by variety." The second is the Song of Songs, which concerns a Bride described as "a garden enclosed, and a fountain sealed up," who rises up and hurries to meet her Beloved; He in turn praises her beauty and embraces her. From the earliest exegesis, both Bridegrooms were universally identified as Christ. But the Bride of the Psalm, accompanied by a train of virgins, was variously interpreted as the Church, the faithful soul, or even as Christ's virgin servants;³² the Bride of the Canticle was identified with the Church, or occasionally the pious soul.³³

But according to one of the most fundamental laws of Christian exegesis, throughout the Scriptures the general had been concealed in the particular, and vice versa; therefore, as Mary was a particular member of the Church, indeed the most exemplary member, whatever referred to the one might by extension refer to the other.³⁴ The medieval Glossa ordinaria stated this explicitly when discussing the Bride of the Psalm: "Quae de Ecclesia generaliter hic dicuntur, ad Mariam specialiter referri possunt."³⁵ Therefore, if

³¹Thérel 134-149 and 182-193; Verdier 81-112, who also includes as a source the prayer "O Intemerata."

³²Thérel 134-136 and 182-193.

³³E. Ann Matter, The Voice of My Beloved: the Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity (Philadelphia, 1990) 151-177; Ann W. Astell, The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages (Ithaca and London, 1990) 42-72.

³⁴For the definitive Christian formulation of this rule: Tyconius 54-89; and Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana ed. and trans. R.P.H. Green (Oxford, 1995) 180-187. See Coathalem for its general application to Mary.

³⁵"Walafrid Strabo, monk of Fulda," "Glossa Ordinaria" PL 113 67-1316, and PL 114 9-752, PL 113, 911.

the Bride was the Church, she must also at the same time be Mary, and as Mary's cult grew, the respective importance of Church and Virgin was reversed: by the twelfth century, this trend had reached its apogee, and a Marian interpretation became dominant for both the Psalm and the Song.³⁶ Both Brides could then be understood as images of Mary received into Heaven as a Queen, an identification further encouraged because both featured in the liturgy for the Assumption, and the Coronation was born as the pre-eminent image of the Virgin's unique and greatest triumph: her victory over death and her co-rule with Christ.

By an extension of these ideas, it can be seen how an image of Mary's Coronation would be peculiarly appropriate for a tomb or burial chapel, such as that of the Camposanto at Pisa (fig. 47). Not only was the Coronation the best image of Mary's glory, it also expressed a hope that the Virgin might intercede on the occupant's behalf, and that through this intercession he or she might also rise to Heaven at Last Judgment. This intercession was the Virgin's special responsibility, and in some sense the reason the Assumption feast laid such stress on her place in Heaven.³⁷ Thus in a laud sung by members of the Disciplinati confraternity in Assisi, the sinners beseeching the Virgin to save them from damnation do not hesitate to remind her of their reciprocal relations:

Per gli peccaturi canpare,
foste facta voi regina,
percio vo piaccia de pregare
per la gente si taipina;
che non sia, trista, dannata,

³⁶For the date: Coathalem 86; for Marian interpretation of the Song: Matter 151-177; Astell 42-72; and Rachel Fulton, "Mimetic Devotion, Marian Exegesis, and the Historical Sense of the Song of Songs" Viator 27 (1996) 85-116.

³⁷Jugie 202-211.

siate per noi, matre, avvocata!

Significantly, when Christ responds that he can refuse no grace or mercy that Mary might ask for on behalf of "gli peccaturi maligne," the title He uses is "Regina, matre mia," and it is then Mary, not Christ, who decides the sinners' fate.³⁸

So it is not surprising to find a Coronation by Guariento over the tomb of Jacopo II da Carrara in Padua in 1351, with Jacopo himself kneeling hopefully in prayer at the Virgin's right hand.³⁹ And presumably Piero di Puccio's fresco in the Camposanto chapel should also be understood in such a light (fig. 47). As such, the inclusion of Eve could only sharpen this hope and linking: if Original Sin had brought pain and death, to Adam, Eve, and all their descendants, Mary offered hope of life: she was the first delivered, but through her, others, including Eve, might follow.

But there was another potential aspect to Coronation imagery, at least for a learned audience: if the particular indicated the general and the general the particular, any image of Mary's triumph could also be an image of the triumph of the Church. It is clear, in fact, that many Coronation images had important political overtones: thus its early use on the main portal of the Cathedral of Reims was partly an assertion of that church's authority to crown the French king, while its 1388 appearance on the high altar of S. Francesco in Bologna seems to have expressed a wish to reassert papal authority during the Great Schism.⁴⁰ The examples could be multiplied: the slippage between Mary and Church was always potentially there.

³⁸Mancini (as in nt. 1) 207-209.

³⁹Flores d'Arcais 65-67.

⁴⁰Flor (as in nt. 29) 67-73; 74-80.

It is possible to over-emphasise this aspect of the Coronation of the Virgin, but it seems likely it might have been germane for some viewers of the Montefalco fresco (fig. 37): from 1306, the town was the main seat of the beleaguered government of the papal Duchy of Spoleto, and thus the central command post for the on-going papal attempts to reclaim the rebellious Italian states.⁴¹ Montefalco's altitude provided some protection at a time when security elsewhere could not be guaranteed, and it served as the administration's main residence (although not its exclusive residence) for about forty years; in the 1320s, the Pieve of S. Fortunato, just outside the town, was converted into a bigger and stronger fortress, suggesting anxiety still lingered.⁴² At the centre of this battle was a Frenchman called Jean Amiel, or Giovanni d'Amelio in Italian, who served as Rector (1323-1332), Special Envoy of the Holy See (1338), and finally Riformatore Generale for all of the lands of the Church in Italy from 1339 to 1341;⁴³ in all these guises, however, his mission, only partly successful, was to reform the government of the Duchy and to control the on-going rebellion and heresy of the Umbrian papal patrimony, though with little success.⁴⁴

⁴¹The bibliography on the Papal government is immense, but see: Chantal Reydellet-Guttinger, L'Administration Pontificale dans le Duché de Spolète (1305-1352) (Florence, 1975); Fausto M. de' Reguardati, L'Umbria, Ducato di Spoleto e Norcia nel sec. XIV: Pagine inedite di storia umbra (Perugia, 1986); and Peter Partner, The Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance (London, 1972). For Papal reconquest attempts: Norman Housely, The Avignon Papacy and the Crusades, 1305-1378 (Oxford, 1986); and the same author's The Italian Crusades: the Papal Angevin Alliance and the Crusades against Christian Lay Powers, 1254-1343 (Oxford, 1982).

⁴²Reydellet-Guttinger 31-32; Luigi Fumi, "La rocca di Montefalco e i pareri tecnici per la sua costruzione (1324)" BDSPU 13 (1907) 469-481; it is no longer extant.

⁴³Silvestro Nessi, "Giovanni d'Amelio: un precursore dell'Albornoz" Spoletium 14 (1970) 19-34; and "Un mecenate francese in Italia: Jean Amiel" Studi francesi 21 (1963) 477-482. He would die, as bishop of Trento, in 1371 at Spoleto.

The presence of the Papal Court in Montefalco was the spur for countless building projects and commissions in the town. Amiel was himself an influential patron: in 1323-24 he called the Sienese Lorenzo Maitani to give advice on the new fortress to be constructed; he commissioned new walls, and he altered the Palazzo Communale which he used for a time as a residence.⁴⁵ But Amiel also left important monuments of his devotion. The best known is the 1333 cycle of Claire of Montefalco in the Augustinian convent of S. Croce, which may record his gratitude at the failure of a Duchy-wide rebellion two years earlier, but he also ordered lost paintings in the pieve of S. Fortunato, the court's church, and in S. Niccolò, and SS. Filippo e Giacomo, as well as surviving works in the sacristy of Sant'Agostino itself.⁴⁶ In this climate, it is perhaps less surprising that the Augustinians of S. Agostino should have almost doubled the size of their church in 1327: both the curia and the inhabitants of Montefalco now had access to the artists and resources needed to create important monuments, and many seem to have been inspired to use them. Significantly, the sculpted inscription on the new facade records: "Tempore Domine Iohannis Papa XXII et Tempore Domini Iohannis de Amelio Generalis Rectoris," and includes the stemmae of the Holy See, and John XXII above the much larger arms of Amiel himself.⁴⁷ And if c.1340-50 is a correct date for the Coronation fresco, then it would seem to be a later instance of this general artistic boom, brought about by the influx of learned patrons and their money.

⁴⁴Reydellet-Guttinger 36-39; see Augustin Theiner, ed., Codex diplomaticus Domini Temporalis S. Sedis, 3 vols. (Rome, 1862) II, 53-56 and 83 for Benedict XII's letters to Amiel about his mission.

⁴⁵Nessi (1963) 478.

⁴⁶Nessi (1963) 478-481.

⁴⁷Nessi (1963) 480.

As the Coronation does not seem to be an image especially promoted by the Augustinians, this immediate background may well help to clarify the patrons' choice of the iconography.⁴⁸ Filled as it was with learned churchmen fighting a losing battle for the rights of the Church, it seems clear Montefalco's general climate, and not just the appearance of its churches and buildings, must have been marked by the Duchy government. For if the Coronation is above all an image of Mary's unique prerogatives, it is also an image of the triumph of the Church, and the iconography of the Montefalco image does not preclude such an association. The Virgin's bowing gesture as she is crowned underlines her position has come about through her son, but in the Montefalco image Christ and Mary-Ecclesia are enthroned at an equal level, and will eventually rule together on the same throne (fig. 38). If Eve (fig. 42) is a reminder of the Genesis curse of death that Mary alone escaped, she is also a reminder of Mary-Ecclesia's predestined role as the necessary path to salvation. Given the presence of the papal curia, battling to control their unruly domains, many people in mid-Trecento Montefalco must have been conversant with these ideas, including perhaps the two lost patrons, in their now generic caps and gowns; in this light, it may be significant that the Coronation of Mary-Ecclesia would become a favourite image of those who succeeded them, the clerks and cardinals of the Avignon Schism itself - and often featured on their tombs.⁴⁹

⁴⁸There is no global study of Augustinian patronage, but see: *Arte e spiritualità nell'ordine agostiniano e il Convento San Nicola a Tolentino* (Tolentino, 1992); *Arte e spiritualità negli ordini mendicanti: gli Agostiniani e il Cappellone di San Nicola a Tolentino* (Rome, 1992); C. Alessi et al., *Lecceto e gli eremi Agostiniani in terra di Siena* (Milan, 1990); Norman (1995); Julian Gardner, "The Cappellone di San Nicola at Tolentino: Some Functions of a Fourteenth-Century Fresco Cycle" *Italian Church Decoration of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance*, ed. William Tronzo (Bologna, 1989) 101-117. The Coronation is not included in the Capellone vault scenes of Mary, for instance.

The rest of the Montefalco figures are angels, and they introduce a final nuance, as well as a final problem. Angels making music or dancing are almost obligatory in Coronations, showing their happiness at the advent of their Queen.⁵⁰ They look on behind or dance in rings before her throne, as in the two Florentine Coronations of c.1380-1400, both now in Altenburg;⁵¹ as at Pisa, they play musical instruments and stand in neat, adoring ranks. Yet at Montefalco, it is not clear whether all the angels are rejoicing: the circling angels above the throne are somewhat ambiguous (fig. 41). It is most likely their ring is a happy dance, indicated by the angels' raised arms and differentiated postures, but it is just possible these assembled angels are in fact surrounding the two figures at the front, placed directly over Christ and Mary on a vertical axis from Eve through the throne. Slightly separated from the others, they are apparently dressed in the military garb of archangels; as such, it is just possible they might be an invocation of Revelation 12, 7-9, which describes a great battle among angels in Heaven at the ends of time.

This might seem like an unlikely inclusion above Mary's Coronation, but it cannot completely be ruled out. For Mary's rule of Heaven and her role as the Second Eve also had apocalyptic overtones, linked as they were to the importance of Mary's intercession at the moment of Last Judgment. This is perhaps most strongly seen in the final work to be considered, the panel attributed to Carlo da Camerino in Cleveland (fig. 1), which in fact portrays the Virgin as the Women of Revelations surrounded by archangels. For

⁴⁹Verdier 161 nt. 28bis; Françoise Baron, "Collèges apostoliques et Couronnement de la Vierge dans la sculpture avignonnaise des XIVe et XVe siècles" *Revue du Louvre* 29 (1979) 169-186.

⁵⁰Reinhold Hammerstein, *Die Musik der Engel: Untersuchungen zur Musikanschauung des Mittelalters* (Bern and Munich, 1962) 234-235.

⁵¹Robert Oertel, *Frühe italienische Malerei in Altenburg* (Berlin, 1961) 125-126.

although it is not immediately apparent, this too is an image of Mary's rule, and of her victory over sin and death.

III. Queen of the Apocalypse

The Cleveland panel was briefly described in the Introduction, but it is worth reiterating a few points.⁵² It is a large rectangle, 191.2 x 98.7 cm, generally in good condition and still in its original frame, except where it has been cut down at the bottom; the quality of work is very high.⁵³ Mary sits nursing the Child on a low podium. Above her head is a small sun, and there is a tarnished crescent moon at her feet, while around her head is a crown of twelve stars, each with a tiny figure shown within it. Gabriel appears at her right hand in the kneeling pose of the Annunciation, and two other saints stand at her left hand; these are probably Michael, here wingless but with the scales, and a military saint holding a rod and a shield with a large red cross on a pale ground (figs. 2-5). Below these saints is a prominent but unidentified coat of arms: a gold star above a wing on a red ground. Below Mary, Eve lies naked apart from a swath of fur, with fruit in hand and tree with snake emerging from between her legs. She is in stark profile, turned to look up at Mary but

⁵²European Paintings Before 1500: Catalogue of Paintings Part I (Cleveland, 1974) 59-61; the 1950 attribution was made by Federico Zeri, "Archangelo di Cola da Camerino: due tempere" Paragone 1 (1950) 37-38. See also: Guldan 132, 218; Schiller 193; Goetz 108-109; Van Marle V, 167-169.

⁵³Examination Report, Carlo da Camerino, Madonna of Humility, 16.795, submitted April 28, 1981; it is composed of three panels, with diagonal cross bracing; the back is now coated in wax; the recommendation was to clean it of dirt, varnish, and retouches, and then to revarnish and retouch it to "minimize the distraction of the damages without falsifying the physical history of this work." Diagonal bracing is in fact unusual: Jacqueline Marette, Connaissance des Primitifs par l'étude du bois (Paris, 1961) 120-121 considers it to be a Spanish practice, and it is not clear why it was adopted here, or if it is in fact more widespread outside Spain than she realised.

therefore blind to the viewer; nor does she have any kind of banderole, which is also unusual.

As mentioned in the Introduction, nothing is known of the original use or location of this work. Its attributed author, Carlo da Camerino, is known only by a crucifix which he signed in 1396 in Macerata Feltria, near Urbino; but all those works attributed to him whose original placement is known come from the Marches around Urbino and Ancona, which might suggest the Cleveland work came from the same area.⁵⁴ Yet the panel's function is unclear: it was obviously a major, and presumably public, commission, with its donor's crest intended to be seen by others, but its long, narrow format and 2/1 proportions are somewhat unusual. It might have been a consciously archaic evocation of such altar panels as Coppo di Marcovaldo's Madonnas; Carlo is known to have copied early and mid-Trecento precedents in other works.⁵⁵ Most recently it has been suggested the panel was probably made for a confraternity, dedicated to the Madonna's praise.⁵⁶

Although this is certainly possible, the work's iconography suggests a patron and audience of considerable theological sophistication, slightly

⁵⁴Cesare Brandi, ed., *Mostra della Pittura Riminese del Trecento* (Rimini, 1935) 53: "Hoc opus factu(m) fu(i)t an(no) d(omi)n(i) MCCCLXXXVI a lu...deci...Carolu(s) da Camerino pi(nx)it." For Carlo: Michele Polverari, ed., *Carlo da Camerino* (Ancona, 1988); Michele Polverari, *La Circoncisione: una tavola attribuita a Carlo da Camerino* (Ancona, 1989); Carl Brandon Strehlke, "Carlo da Camerino" *BM* 131 (1989) 799-800; Giuseppe Vitalini Sacconi, "Carlo da Camerino in Sant'Agostino a Recanati" *Antichità viva* 15 (1976) 12-17; Ann Gabhart, "A Late Medieval Altarpiece" *Bulletin of the Walters Art Gallery* 23/6 (1971) n.p. [1-3]; Federico Zeri, "Carlo da Camerino" *Proporzioni* 2 (1948) 162-163; more generally: Giuseppe Vitalini Sacconi, *Pittura Marchigiana: la scuola Camerinese* (Trieste, 1968) 53-68 for Carlo.

⁵⁵For such Madonna panels: van Os (1990) I, 23-29: these include Coppo's 225 x 125 *Madonna del Bordone* from the high altar of S. Maria dei Servi in Siena and the 238 x 135 cm *Madonna* from Orvieto; these approximate the Cleveland panel dimensions. For Carlo's *Circumcision*, closely related to Ambrogio Lorenzetti's 1342 *Purification* (or *Presentation*): Polverari (1989).

⁵⁶Simi Varanelli 77-99; her argument is however iconographic, not morphological.

unexpected in a confraternity group. Uniquely, Mary is here represented not only as Queen of Heaven and the Second Eve, but as the Woman of Revelation 12, 1-5:

And a great sign appeared in heaven: A woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars: And being with child, she cried travailing in birth, and was in pain to be delivered. And here was seen another sign in heaven:...a great dragon, having seven heads, and ten horns...stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered; that, when she should be delivered, he might devour her son. And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with an iron rod: and her son was taken up to God, and to his throne.

This woman then flees to the wilderness to escape the dragon, "that old serpent, who is called the devil and Satan, who seduceth the whole world." A heavenly army, led by the Archangel Michael, is dispatched against the dragon and his angels and defeats them; a great voice announces salvation is come, and the woman is given great two wings to ascend and escape further persecution.

It can immediately be seen how the Woman who gives birth to the king of nations could be identified with the Virgin, and in fact there are numerous images of her with the Revelation attributes.⁵⁷ Thus in Carlo da Camerino's panel, Mary is presented with the twelve stars round her head, and the moon at her feet; even her clothing with the sun has been rendered by the intricate gold striations of her robe, and redoubled by the sun placed above her.

⁵⁷Studies include: Laurie J. Bergamini, "From Narrative to Icon: the Virgin Mary and the Woman of the Apocalypse in Thirteenth Century English Art and Devotion" *Studies in Iconography* 13 (1989-1990) 80-112; Anthony Cutler, "The *Mulier Amicta Sole* and her Attendants: an Episode in Late Medieval Finnish Art" *JWCI* 29 (1966) 117-134; Ewald Vetter, "Mulier amicta sole und Mater Salvatoris" *Müncher Jahrbuch des bildenden Kunst* 9-10 (1958-59) 32-71; Thérél 158-162; Schiller 192-194. For the Apocalypse generally: Yves Christie, ed., *L'Apocalypse de Jean: traditions exégétiques et iconographiques, IIIe-XIIIe siècles* (Geneva, 1979); Annegritt Schmitt, "Die Apokalypse des Robert von Anjou" *Pantheon* 28 (1970) 475-503; Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocalypse in Art* (London, 1939).

Furthermore, Michael is also present, accompanied by another warrior saint, possibly another angel as well: although wingless, he holds the same rod of office as the wingless Michael above him, and his tunic is similar to that of the warrior angels of another panel attributed to Carlo, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.⁵⁸ Together, they would represent those who saved the Woman from the ancient serpent, here threatening Eve at Mary's feet.

Unusually, however, within each of the twelve stars of Mary's halo there is a small man: the attributes of these figures include the papal keys, a sword, and two books, making it clear these are the apostles, assembled as her crown (figs. 2, 3). There are only two other known instances of this imagery, both also from the Marches: another panel attributed to Carlo formerly in the Lampugnani collection in Milan, and a fresco by the Salimbeni brothers in the slightly later Oratorio di S. Giovanni Battista in Urbino.⁵⁹ The twelve stars are of course appropriate for the Woman of the Apocalypse, but the other two images do not include the other attributes of the woman; what they have in common, rather, is that they all are versions of the so-called Madonna of Humility, a modern typology indicating the Virgin seated on a cushion or on the ground, sometimes nursing the Child.⁶⁰ Such Madonnas were often shown

⁵⁸Polverari (1988) 29; JW Goodison and GH Robertson, Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge: Catalogue of the Italian Schools, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1967) II, 29-30; the tunics are pink over blue at Cambridge, pink over yellow at Cleveland.

⁵⁹Polverari (1988) 32, and Kunstmuseum Luzern: italienische Kunst (Lucerne, 1946) cat. 77; Penelope A. Dunford, "The Iconography of the Frescoes in the Oratorio di S. Giovanni at Urbino" JWCI 36 (1973) 367-373; and Pietro Zampetti, Gli affreschi di Lorenzo e Jacopo Salimbeni nell'Oratorio di S. Giovanni di Urbino (Urbino, 1956).

⁶⁰The fundamental studies: Georgiana Goddard King, "The Virgin of Humility" AB 17 (1935) 474-491; and Millard Meiss, "The Madonna of Humility" AB 18 (1936) 435-464. There is now a thesis on this topic, which will therefore not be discussed here: Beth Ann Williamson, "The Virgin *Lactans* and the Madonna of Humility: Image and Devotion in Italy, Metz, and Avignon in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1996. See also: Simi Varanelli, van Os (1990) II, 75-85; Ilse Hecht, "Madonna of Humility" Bulletin of The Art Institute of Chicago 70/6 (1976) 10-13; Carl Huter, "Gentile da Fabriano and the

with the apocalyptic stars; one of the earliest surviving versions, the 1346 panel by the Genoese painter Bartolommeo da Camogli now in Palermo, created for a confraternity, shows Mary nursing with twelve stars round her head, and there are several other examples in Naples alone.⁶¹

Yet it was less common in these Humility images to include the moon at the Virgin's feet, and only very occasionally was any attempt made to convey that she was "clothed with the sun." More importantly, the Cleveland panel seems to be the only work to combine all these aspects with a portrayal of the apostles in the twelve stars, as well as the only image to include Michael and another saint, invoking the warring angels of Revelation; it is also, of course, the only image to include Eve and the serpent itself. It seems clear, therefore, that the Virgin is here being very closely identified with the Apocalypse figure, far more than she normally is in other Humility images, including those that can be linked to confraternities, and this specificity must be explained.

But to understand the reasons for the apostles' presence, as well how this image might be linked to the dogma of the Assumption, it is necessary to know something of the interpretation of the Apocalyptic Woman, and how she became a figure of Mary. This was not, in fact, her original interpretation: like the Bride of the Canticle or of Psalm 44, the Woman was for centuries identified with the Church rather than with its greatest member.⁶² From the earliest commentary to discuss the Woman, composed in the third century, she was identified as Ecclesia, struggling to give birth to the faithful under the

Madonna of Humility" *Arte Veneta* 24 (1970) 26-34; van Os (1969); Schiller 191-192; Guldan 102-105.

⁶¹Meiss 435-436; Bologna figs. VII 34-37, 87, VIII 18-19.

⁶²Pierre Prigent, *Apocalypse 12: Histoire de l'exégèse* (Tübingen, 1959), especially 3-23.

reign of Antichrist and waiting for the final judgment; this commentary also stated, however, that the twelve stars of her crown were the twelve apostles, just as they are shown in the Cleveland panel.⁶³ A century later, Tyconius, the writer who explained the importance of recapitulation in biblical narratives, would also systematise the rules of Apocalyptic exegesis, and establish the Woman as the Church, her twelve stars as the apostles, the moon as the false church of heresy, the sun as the justice of Christ, and her pregnancy as a spiritual birth of the faithful into Christ's church; Revelation as a whole was interpreted as a description of the eternal and on-going battle of the Church against the Enemy, the ancient Serpent.⁶⁴ These specific identifications were not stable, but the method of interpretation was, and many centuries later, similar points were made by Rupert of Deutz (c. 1075-1129), in a influential commentary dedicated to the Archbishop of Cologne; in his own discussion of the Woman, Rupert says:

Significabat namque mulier illa sanctam Ecclesiam, quam et in multis prophetarum locis Scripturam invenimus appellari mulierem viro suo, id est, Deo conjuntam et dilectam ...Haec mulier extunc recte dicitur "amicta sole," ex quo Christum verum justitiae Solem accepit in repromissione...In capite hujus mulieris corona stellarum duodecim conspicitur, quia in initio nascentis Ecclesiae duodecim patriarchae, itemque in initio renascentis ejusdem duodecim apostoli notissimi ac splendidi dinumernatur. Nunc interim ordinem mirabilium coelestium secuturi, coronam duodecim stellarum, numerum intelligimus duodecim filiorum sive tribuum Israel.⁶⁵

⁶³This was a commentary by Hippolytus, now known only from later sources: Prigent 4-6.

⁶⁴Prigent 13-17; Kenneth B. Steinhauser, The Apocalypse Commentary of Tyconius: A History of Its Reception and Influence (Frankfurt am Main, 1987).

⁶⁵Rupert, Abbot of Deutz, "In Apocalypsim Joannis Apostoli" PL 169, 825-1214, 1040-1042. For the dedication and influence of Rupert's work: John H. Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz (Berkeley, 1983) 275-282; and for a specific manuscript: P.K. Klein, "Rupert de Deutz et son commentaire illustré de l'Apocalypse à Heiligenkreuz" Journal des Savants (1980) 119-140.

Yet when Rupert moves to the dragon, his interpretation changes slightly: Satan has come against both the Church and the Virgin Mary.⁶⁶ In this, his work reflected a growing interpretative tradition associated with preaching for Marian feasts: like the Brides of the Psalm and Song, the Woman of Apocalypse 12 featured in the liturgies of Mary's feasts, helping their eventual co-identification; once again the shift to a primarily Marian interpretation came with the scholastics and their contemporaries.⁶⁷ Thus when the Cistercian Caesarius of Heisterbach (c. 1180-c. 1240) began his account of Mary's miracles, in a book which may have been intended for the education of novices, it seemed natural to him to begin with the Woman of Revelations:

S. John, in the Apocalypse saw *a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon beneath her feet and a crown of twelve stars upon her head*. This woman is the Virgin Mary, brighter than the sun in the splendour of charity; the moon, that is the world, is beneath her feet to show her contempt for earthly glory; she is crowned with all the virtues as with a diadem gemmed with stars; and, a higher dignity than all these, she is pregnant with the Divine offspring.⁶⁸

And as a Marian interpretation came to predominate, another aspect of the exegesis took on a new light: this was the traditional identification, made as early as the mid-sixth century, of the dragon who threatens the Woman and her infant with the woman who crushes the serpent's head in Genesis 3, 15.⁶⁹ This is the so-called "Proto-evangelium" which also features so prominently in

⁶⁶Rupert, "In Apocalypsim" PL 169, 1042-1064.

⁶⁷Prigent 31-37.

⁶⁸Caesarius of Heisterbach I, 453-454; he then praises her with verses from the Psalms and the Canticle.

⁶⁹Prigent 19-20, who attributes the first use to Primasius, Bishop of Adrumetta (ob. c. 550).

discussions of the links between Mary and Eve: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel." Here was another reason to link Mary, the Second Eve, with the Woman of Revelation, placing her at both the beginning and the end of time, and not surprisingly, in the sermons for Mary's Assumption and Coronation the two themes were often brought together. Thus Bernard of Clairvaux preached an entire sermon on the Woman for the Octave of the Assumption: having asked whether this Woman could in fact be Mary, rather than the Church, he answers his own question without hesitation: "Nimirum ipsa est quondam a Deo promissa mulier, serpentis antiqui caput virtutis pede contritura."⁷⁰

Yet because, as always in the Scriptures, the particular was present in the general, for Apocalypse too a Marian exegesis could coexist with the earlier identification of the Church. Thus the Duecento Franciscan Bonaventure of Bagnoregio specified the Woman could be seen as both Mary and the Church in its militant or triumphant guise; the twelve stars were variously the saints, including the twelve patriarchs and the apostles, as Rupert had explained, or else Mary's twelve prerogatives.⁷¹ The identification of the Woman might depend on context: when preaching two Sundays after Easter, Bonaventure's contemporary Anthony of Padua told his Franciscan brothers the Woman was the Church "allegorice" and the faithful soul "moraliter;" yet in another sermon, this time for the Annunciation, the Woman was a figure of the Virgin, and the twelve stars, her twelve special joys.⁷² In the first case, he

⁷⁰Bernard of Clairvaux, "Dominica infra Octavam Assumptionis" *Opera* IV, 262-274, 262-264.

⁷¹Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, "De Assumptione B. Virginis Mariae, Sermo VI" *Opera Omnia*, 10 vols. (Claras Aquas (Quarrachi), 1882-1902) IX, 700-706.

was echoing the Glossa Ordinaria; for the second use his source was Bernard of Clairvaux, as Anthony himself made clear.⁷³

So in portraying the Virgin as the Woman of the Apocalypse, and in linking her in this guise with Eve's own battles against the ancient serpent, the Cleveland panel was following a very important tradition of Marian preaching and praise, and making a sanctioned link between the beginning and end of Christian struggle (fig. 1). The painting did so, however, with amazing economy. For instance, rather than a simple court of saints, Gabriel, Michael and the warrior below him can also be understood as "attributes" of the Virgin, reminders of her preeminent role in the final fight against evil. Thus Gabriel is shown in the pose of the Annunciation at Mary's side, evoking the exact moment at which the Virgin undid Eve's fault and assured Christ's final victory over death and damnation (figs 2,4). Michael may have a dual role (figs. 3, 5): he was of course the commander of the army which attacked the Woman's tormentor, an association reinforced by the angel with the shield below him, and "the ancient serpent" itself, but Michael's prominent attribute, the balance, refers above all to his role at the Last Judgment.

This brief synopsis of the history of human salvation - Fall, Incarnation, and Final Triumph - coalesces in the juxtaposition of Mary and Eve, pictured here with a female-headed snake beside her. This is the first time we have seen such imagery, although it occurs in other Mary/Eve panels that must predate this one, including for instance a 1358 triptych by Lippo Vanni (fig. 68) and a 1371 fresco at Magione, near Perugia (fig. 49).⁷⁴ The

⁷²Anthony of Padua, "Dominica II post Pascha" and "In Annuntiatione" Sermones dominicales et festivi, 3 vols. (Padua, 1979) I, 273; III, 110-111.

⁷³For the "Glossa" PL 114, 731-732; Bernard as above.

serpent's female head is in fact quite normal in Trecento images: the Venerable Bede was reported to have said that because like is attractive to like, Satan assumed a woman's guise to appear to Eve.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, the serpent's inclusion seems to underline the devil's present menace; it is as if Eve's defeat by the ancient enemy is constantly threatening, as she faces it, fruit in hand, looking to Mary for help. Yet by including the Apocalypse references, the image stresses the serpent's victory is only temporary: the just will triumph in the end.

Moreover, Mary's portrayal nursing the Child may stress both her influence with him and the tenderness of her intercessory role. Mary is shown feeding the Child in several other Eve/Mary images, probably because it was another sign of the flesh she shared with Christ (and Eve) as well as her kindness in caring for him: the mother's milk was considered to continue shaping the flesh of the child's body even after the birth.⁷⁶ The sinners in the

⁷⁴These works are discussed in Chapters Four and Five; female-headed snakes also occur in several smaller panels by Paolo di Giovanni Fei, Angelo Puccinelli, Giuliano di Simone, and Niccolò di Buonaccorso: see the Appendix, 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 (figs. 84, 87-91).

⁷⁵John K. Bonnell, "The Serpent with a Human Head in Art and in Mystery Play" *American Journal of Archaeology* 21 (1917) 255-29; who believes an incorrect attribution to Bede came in Petrus Comestor's *Historia Libri Genesis*, "ut ait Beda, similia similibus applaudunt." For a Trecento assertion of the pedigree: Wenzel 665.

⁷⁶Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Blood Parents and Milk Parents: Wet Nursing in Florence, 1300-1530" *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Italy*, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Chicago and London, 1985) 132-164. As mentioned, Beth Williamson has just completed a thesis on *lactans* imagery (as in nt. 60), and therefore it will not be treated here in depth; but see also: Margaret Miles, "The Virgin's One Bare Breast: Female Nudity and Religious Meaning in Tuscan Early Renaissance Culture" *The Female Body in Western Culture*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge, MA, 1986) 193-208; Anthony Culter, "The Cult of the Galaktotrophousa in Byzantium and Italy" *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 37 (1987) 335-350; Dorothy C. Shorr, *The Christ Child in Devotional Images in Italy during the XIV Century* (New York, 1954) 58-81; L. Tramoyeres Blasco, "La Virgen de la Leche en el arte I: Escuelas extranjeras" *Musevm* 3 (1913) 79-118. Mary is also nursing in the fresco at Magione (fig. 49), and in panels by Paolo di Giovanni Fei, Giuliano di Simone, and the Master of the Straus Madonna: see Appendix 1, 2, 7, 9 (figs. 84, 90, 92).

Laud mentioned earlier, for instance, are anxious Mary should make use of this bargaining asset:

Le poppe e 'l piecto al tuo filglo
mostragli, con quel che 'l lactassti;
le mano e 'l viso tuo vermilglo
e 'l ventre do' che 'l portasti...⁷⁷

As Eve and these later sinners look directly to Mary for help, so too could the Christian before the panel, if he or she remained on guard.

In all its aspects, then, this was an image that reminded its viewers of Mary's rule, and perhaps that she had been assumed into Heaven after giving birth to the King of Nations. Arguably, its use of the juxtaposition of Mary and Eve is the most sophisticated example of all: it shows a particular knowledge of how the exegesis of the Woman of the Apocalypse might be combined with that of Mary's role as the Second Eve. This is important for a consideration of its commission and audience: the Cleveland panel seems addressed to a theologically sophisticated viewer, and the final detail, Mary's twelve apostle stars, would seem to confirm this. For when the Woman of the Apocalypse was identified as the Virgin, her twelve stars were normally explained as her unique prerogatives: Bernard for example calls them "duodecim praerogativas gratiarum," and links them to the crown of the (ascended) Bride.⁷⁸ There were exceptions: Bonaventure, for instance, had mentioned they might adorn the Woman as either the Church or Mary.⁷⁹ But the twelve apostles are more normally found in exegesis of Revelation, and there is little evidence this

⁷⁷Mancini (as in nt. 1) 207.

⁷⁸Bernard of Clairvaux, "Dominica infra Octavam Assumptionis" *Opera* IV, 267.

⁷⁹Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, "De Assumptione B. Virginis Mariae, Sermo VI" *Opera* (as in nt. 71) IX, 700-706.

second tradition was diffused to a wide audience: in the mid-Quattrocento, for instance, Bernardino of Siena produced a tract on the battle of the Antichrist for the Heavenly Jerusalem, incorporating aspects of Revelation, but he did so in Latin, with no mention of the Woman or the Virgin.⁸⁰ In fact, the apostles' inclusion as an almost generic attribute of the Virgin of Humility in the two paintings mentioned in Milan and Urbino may suggest a misunderstanding of their specific significance.⁸¹ Based on this evidence, as well as the work's wider iconography, it seems likely that the Cleveland panel was intended for a learned audience, the more limited group of Christians familiar with preaching on the Apocalypse, which might suggest its original use was not so much as a confraternity panel as a more private image.

In the end, however, it is dangerous to draw too many conclusions about the panel's audience, although at least one contemporary work may lend some support to the argument that it (and other Mary/Eve images) could and did appeal to a select, learned group. This is a ruined fresco of c.1390 attributed to the Master of the Dormitio of Terni (fig. 48), an important painter working in southern Umbria at the end of the Trecento.⁸² The painting is found in the collegiata church of S. Gregorio Maggiore in Spoleto; although detached in 1951, it was almost certainly originally located on the back apse

⁸⁰Bernardino of Siena, La battaglia e il saccheggio del Paradiso cioè della Gerusalemme Celeste, ed. and trans. Franco Cardini (Siena, 1979).

⁸¹It is possible, therefore, that this imagery originated with, or was popularised by, this painter in this panel or in a similar work, and visible to later artists in the area.

⁸²Federico Zeri, "Tre argomenti umbri" Bollettino d'arte 68 (1963) 29-45 made the attribution; Bruno Toscano, Spoleto in pietre (Spoleto, 1963) 43; Grondona 172; and Silvestro Nessi, "La basilica romanica di S. Gregorio e le sue vicende artistiche" La Basilica di San Gregorio Maggiore in Spoleto (Spoleto, 1979) 63-104. For the Maestro of the Dormitio of Terni, see also: Todini 130-131; and Corrado Fratini, "Pittori dell'area ternana fra la fine del '300 e l'inizio del '400" Dall'Albornoz all'età dei Borgia: Questioni di cultura figurativa nell'Umbria meridionale (Atti del Convegno di studi, Amelia, 1987) (Todi, 1990) 127-175.

wall over the high altar, in the raised choir of the Romanesque church.⁸³ In its present condition, little can be said about its iconography; it shows the Madonna and Child on a deep throne, flanked by two saints on either side, possibly two male, two female; they might perhaps be Gregory and Parattale, to whom the church was dedicated, and the two saints Abbondanza, one of whom had buried Gregory while the second founded the church.⁸⁴ On the gradino there are two kneeling angels, one with an organ and one with a lute. Below them, a lumpy figure of Eve lies in a beautifully flowered garden. She is naked and wrapped in a white cloth, with loose blond hair; at her left is a small tree with the snake, and she holds a long banderole. This is almost completely effaced, but must have been in Latin, as the word "Dei" can be made out. Below are the remains of an inscription, also in Latin: +HOC OPUS FECIT FIERI DNS?...PRIOR ISTIUS ECCLES. IN Mo ... MENSE MARTIJ...⁸⁵

Together with the fresco's placement, these inscriptions strongly suggest that at the end of the Trecento, when the Cleveland panel was made,

⁸³For the original placement: Zeri (1963) 33-34; for the church see Nessi, as above; Lamberto Gentili et al., *L'Umbria. Manuali per il territorio: Spoleto* (Rome, 1978) 110-117, 143-144; and Giovanni Antonelli, "La chiesa collegiata di S. Gregorio Maggiore in Spoleto e i documenti pontifici del suo archivio" *Atti del V convegno nazionale di storia dell'architettura* (Florence, 1957) 483-494. The Trecento archives from the Basilica still exist in the Diocesan archives, but have been irrevocably damaged by water; several sources also mention manuscript studies of the church by Pietro Pirri and H. Fausti, but neither of these is known to the town librarian or the diocesan archivist. The church is currently closed for restorations under the supervision of Dottoressa Giordana Benazzi of the Soprintendenza in Perugia.

⁸⁴Kaftal (1965) 2-3 describes Abundantia as a nun of c. 804 who built S. Gregorio; she is co-patron with Gregory of Spoleto, while another Abundantia of c. 325, buried the remains of S. Gregory and others. Gregory is described by Kaftal (1968) 539-40 as a priest and martyr beheaded at Spoleto under Diocletian, represented as a young beardless tonsured priest, holding a book and chalice; no Parattale or Parattalus is listed. These identifications are only suggestions, given the present state of the painting; no attributes are visible.

⁸⁵Zeri 35 (as in nt. 82) gives this inscription as: hoc opus fecit fieri...prior istius ecclesiae...anno dni. Mccclx....a 7 de mense martii, suggesting the fresco has deteriorated since 1963.

the Mary/Eve theme was still attractive to a literate (that is Latin-reading) male religious audience, including the prior who commissioned the Spoleto work; in fact, given its position in the raised apse of the church, the fresco would not even have been visible to the laity of the church.

IV. Conclusions

We have seen that Mary's queenship as the Second Eve had at least two potential associations: linked as it was to her Assumption, Mary's Coronation stressed the Virgin's special victory over sin and death, as well as her power as Queen of Heaven to help fellow Christians share her victory at the moment of the Last Judgment. As such, a Coronation with Eve was a fitting image to preside over the Pisa Camposanto; and it is possible that such an association was also pertinent at Montesiepi, where Mary was shown enthroned with Eve in what may well have been a funerary chapel, for either Ristoro della Selvatella or Vanni Salimbeni.

Furthermore, because Mary was also Ecclesia, any image of Mary or her coronation could have a more political aspect, especially for a learned audience: at Montefalco, where the government of the Papal Duchy of Spoleto had taken refuge against its rebellious subjects, the Coronation fresco might also have contained a wish for the triumph and honour of the earthly Church. Here again this was pertinent at S. Galgano, where Mary-Ecclesia ruled in triumph over a Paradise filled with Cistercian saints, in an image for the Cistercian monks who served her - or them.

These two aspects are present to some degree in every single image of Mary-Ecclesia, and perhaps above all in any image where her rule is stressed by visual means, and it can be argued that the Cleveland panel brought these

two strands together. Certainly, the panel lays a notable stress on Mary's role in protecting and delivering from evil, beginning with Eve herself, and its Apocalypse imagery would presumably be reminders of the final victory to come, and of Mary's role in making it possible and attainable for others. Yet here too Mary-Ecclesia could also have had more immediate import, for the battle in Revelation to save the Woman was also used as a metaphor for the contemporary church's struggle and/or corruption, and this trend gained strength in the years of the Avignon papacy, when many senior members of the papal court owned books on the Apocalypse, and Urban VI (among others) was identified as the persecuting dragon.⁸⁶

The Cleveland panel was certainly created in this period, probably for a learned audience, and in a region, the Marches of Ancona, where Church and state were often, and violently, at odds; the Schism brought virtual civil war to the area, and the horrendous massacre of the population of Cesena by papal troops in 1377 was only the most widely lamented in a series of atrocities.⁸⁷ It is possible, therefore, that in Carlo da Camerino's panel, as in Jean d'Amiel's Montefalco, the imagery of a ruling Mary with Eve at her feet contains an allusion to the struggle and triumph of the earthly Church over evil buried somewhere within it. This potential link will in fact be central to the image of the next chapter, the 1371 fresco of Santa Maria della Grazie in the Umbrian town of Magione.

⁸⁶Roberto Rusconi, L'attesa della fine. Crisi della società, profezia ed Apocalisse in Italia al tempo del grande scisma d'Occidente (1378-1417) (Rome, 1979) 22-24 and 54.

⁸⁷Partner 369, and 365 for Cesena.

CHAPTER FOUR

HONOREM TIBI PANDIS IN COELI PALATIO: S. MARIA DELLE GRAZIE, MAGIONE

Tu tesauero, tu ricchezza,
tu virtude, tu larghezza,
tu se' l'imperial fortezza
per corona resplendente
-Laudario di Cortona, fourteenth-century.¹

Magione is a small town about twenty kilometers north-west of Perugia, on the road toward Lake Trasimeno (Maps I, II). In the Middle Ages it was called Carpine, Carpena, or Pian di Carpine, and it produced at least one notable citizen: in the early Duecento, one of the first Franciscans, Giovanni da Pian di Carpine (ob.1252), wrote an account of his voyage to Mongolia, a small legacy remembered by the seat of the Italian-Mongolian Friendship Association in Magione's main street.² Despite Giovanni, however, Magione's medieval history remains obscure, and has been left largely to local historians, more or less prolific, and more or less reliable;³ and as recently 1974, the editor of Giovanni's voyage could describe the friar's birthplace as "una località non rintracciata...in provincia di Perugia."⁴

¹Anna Maria Guarnieri, ed., Laudario di Cortona (Spoleto, 1991) 67-72; the full Laude has twenty-two stanzas.

²Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, "Viaggio a' Tartari (Historia Mongolorum)" Marco Polo Il Millione (Novara, 1974); for his Franciscan career: John R.H. Moorman, A History of the Franciscan Order: From its Origins to the Year 1517 (Oxford, 1968) 68-70, 162-166, 232-233.

³Giovanni Riganelli, Pian di Carpine: La storia nella microstoria (Perugia, 1985); there are two other sources, much less reliable: Trento Bartoccioni, ed., La Magione (Perugia, 1976); Giuseppe Fabretti, "Memorie di Magione," Biblioteca Augusta di Perugia, ms. 1941. See Map II for the location of places mentioned in this chapter.

⁴Giovanni da Pian del Carpine 8.

So it is a surprise to come across the large and sophisticated fresco, dated 1371, in the small church of Santa Maria delle Grazie (fig. 49); it seems to belong to the history of some other, more important place.⁵ The painting's setting reinforces this impression, for it is unusual to find a Trecento fresco placed directly over the high altar; and although the work is in relatively good condition, it is abraded at the top and at the bottom corners, and surrounded by an incongruous Baroque-style frame.⁶ The feeling of detachment is further encouraged because, although the church and hospital of the "Gloriosa Vergine Maria, detto anche della Madonna" is first securely documented in 1446, when the foundation was listed in the Perugian catasto, the present church is Baroque with nineteenth-century alterations and twentieth-century fixtures (fig. 50).⁷

The creation of this impressive painting in a forgotten little church is an intriguing puzzle, especially since a prominent but unidentified donor appears kneeling at Mary's left hand (fig. 52). But the work has not interested

⁵For Santa Maria: Trento Bartoccioni, La Chiesa e l'Affresco della Madonna delle Grazie, Magione (Assisi, 1968); Ettore Ricci, Ricordo delle feste solenni del SS. Crocifisso e della Madonna delle Grazie celebrate in Magione nell'Archidiocesi di Perugia dal XXI al XXVIII agosto MDCCCXXI, Numero unico, Magione, 21 agosto 1921.

⁶An inscription to the left of the high altar records: DOM Templum hoc et altare maius Bme V.M. de Hospitalis. Francis Riccardus Ferniani episcopus perusinus AD MDCCXLVII V nonas maij solemni ritu consecrav. Restauratum ad MCMVII Rectore Raynaldo Veracchi. The records of restorations kept by the Soprintendenza in Perugia, reference AS (C) 11-4, note only that there were interventions between 1922 and 1941, and a "Restauro completo dopo il 28 ottobre 1922." Ricci records a local tradition that the fresco was originally located on the north wall and transferred during seventeenth-century rebuilding. Its placement and frame make a full examination difficult, but I have discussed the problem with Julian Gardner, who believes it would have been unusual for such a large work to be successfully moved at that time.

⁷Alberto Grohmann, Città e territorio tra medioevo ed età moderna (Perugia, secc. XIII-XVI) (Perugia, 1981) 864, nt. 43; it is also recorded in 1493. Riganelli 73 argues the foundation of S. Maria was probably a civic one, "nella seconda metà del secolo XIV primi anni del XV." But it is just possible the church should be identified with the "Ecclesia Plebs Veteris" which owned property in the town in a Catasto of 1361, mentioned by Riganelli 78, who notes: "trovandosi nel toponimo Plebs Vetus in pertinenza di Pian di Carpine, doveva essere nella zona."

many art historians: most of the limited discussion of the fresco has centred on its possible attribution to Andrea di Giovanni of Orvieto, first proposed by Gnoli and usually discounted in favour of an anonymous artist of the Orvietan school.⁸ The most extensive comment, by Miklòs Boskovits, is not exactly enthusiastic: "Di fattura non particolarmente fine benché non privo di una solenne gravità, questo affresco c'interessa particolarmente per i rapporti del suo autore con il piu grande Cola Petruccioli."⁹

It will be clear, however, that the riddle of the elegant fresco of Santa Maria delle Grazie is central to a primary concern of this thesis: it is the only painting of the Virgin and Child with Eve which includes a well-preserved image of its donor, and as such may be the clearest indication of those who had such images created, and the best chance to explore their possible interpretations of the imagery. Thus the following chapter will explore the interesting story of how this painting came to be created in Trecento Magione: it first presents the fresco and the immediate background of its execution; it will then identify the donor, and concludes with his possible understanding of the work.

⁸Umberto Gnoli, *Pittori e miniatori nell'Umbria* (Spoleto, 1923) 25; Van Marle V, 107, and "La scuola pittorica orvietana" *Bollettino d'arte* 3 (1923/24) 305-335, 316 (predecessor of the Orvietan artist Cola Petruccioli); Toesca 680, note 202 (un lorenzettiano umbro); Goetz 108; Guldán 131-132; Todini I, 355; Grondona 172-173 (Andrea di Giovanni). Most recently, Pier Paolo Donati, "Andrea di Giovanni a Belvedere" *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Ugo Procacci*, eds. Maria Grazia Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto and Paolo Dal Poggetto (Milan, 1977) 172-176 mentions the fresco without accepting or rejecting the attribution to Andrea.

⁹Miklòs Boskovits, *La Pittura umbra e marchigiana fra Medioevo e Rinascimento* (Florence, 1973) 20-21. Both Cola and Andrea were both listed in the shop of Ugolino del Prete Ilario, active in the Cathedral of Orvieto in 1368; Andrea is also documented by a 1402 painting for Sant'Egidio in Corneto. See in general: Italdo Faldi, "Connessioni fra l'Umbria meridionale e il Viterbese" *Dall'Albornoz all'età dei Borgia: Questioni di cultura figurativa nell'Umbria meridionale, Atti del Convegno di Studi, 1-3 ottobre, 1987* (Todi, 1990) 99-112; Fratini, Donati, Previtali, Carli (1965) 87-89; and Longhi. Cola Petruccioli is also discussed in Appendix n. 2, and was the author of Active and Contemplative Life (fig. 36) discussed in Chapter Two.

I. The Madonna of Graces

The Virgin and Child are enthroned against a cloth of honour on a podium of wood, probably to indicate the wooden step before an altar (fig. 51). Mary is presented as a queen (fig. 53), in a now very dark blue mantle with gold stars, and a darker edging with gold dots; she is haloed and wears an tiara crown with fleur-de-lys over a light veil. She looks down at the nursing Christ Child, wrapped in a red cloth with an ermine lining, who is portrayed looking out at the viewer, with his bare feet crossed; at their feet are a sun and a now tarnished moon.¹⁰ The Virgin and Child are flanked by two flying angels and three standing angels on either side, all in light-coloured garments scattered with gold leaves; each one holds a scroll with an inscription, and together they form a version of the "Gaude" which was part of the Roman Office for the Octave of the Virgin.¹¹ It zigzags from right to left, bottom to top:

GAUDE VIRGO MATER CHRISTI QUAE PER AUREM CONCEPISTI
GABRIELE NUNTIO.

GAUDE QUIA DEO PLENA PEPERISTI SINE POENA CUM PUDORIS
LILIO.

GAUDE QUIA MAGI DONA TUO NATO FERUNT BONA QUEM TENES
IN GREMIO.

GAUDE QUIA POST CHRISTUM SCANDIS ET HONOREM TIBI PANDIS
IN COELI PALATIO UBI FRUCTUS VENTRIS.

¹⁰Cf. Psalm 71, 5, "And he shall continue with the sun, and before the moon, throughout all generations."

¹¹See for example "Historiae rhythmicae. Liturgische Reimofficien" *AHMA* XXIV (1986), 56-61, 57 (Die Martis, Prosa 1), "Sequentiae ineditae. Liturgische Prosen" *AHMA* XLII (1903) 82-84; or "Pia Dictamina. Reimgebete und Leselieder" *AHMA* XLVI (1905) 134-135.

GAUDE CHRISTO ASCENDENTE SUPER CELO TE VIDENTE MOTU
FERT(UR) PROPRIO.

GAUDE QUIA (TUI NATI) QUEM DOLEBAS MORTEM PATI FULGET
RESURRECTIO.¹²

Three of the angels hold objects related to the words of their verse; the angel of "Magi dona" holds a jar like that carried by the Magi in images of their Adoration; the angel of "Concepisti con pudoris lilio" holds lilies; and the middle left angel ("Post Christum scandis...in coeli palatio") holds a carefully delineated tower (fig. 54), with a large arched entrance, a piano nobile with gothic windows, and a narrower top with crenellated ramparts, somewhat similar to the large tower topped by a crown held by the virtue of Faith in Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Maestà at Massa Marittima (fig. 35).¹³

Below this group, Eve lies on her right hip with her left leg bent sharply and raised (fig. 55). This again is a figure clearly related to Montesiepi: her direct gaze, position, and white shift and fur on her shoulders are very similar, and her left hand once again grasps a large fig branch without fruit while her right holds a banderole. But several features have changed: the First Mother is shown with a lozenge-shaped halo and a small, blunt cap or crown, and the long inscriptions of Montesiepi or Spoleto have been replaced by the lapidary "Serpens decepit me & comedi" of Genesis 3, 13; as in the image at Cleveland, she is accompanied by a female-headed snake, but here it is caught in medias res, coiled around her arm and with its whispering speech indicated by a cone-shaped "breath" emerging from its mouth and ending near her ear. And she is flanked by two small kneeling figures (figs. 56, 57): on the

¹²Bartoccioni (1968) 22-26 gives slightly different version of this transcription, with an Italian translation.

¹³Norman (1995) 478-503.

left is a bearded man with a walking stick, in a brown cap and knee-length tunic, white hose and dark shoes; he is probably to be understood as a pilgrim, similar to those depicted in both Guariento's panel of an Angel with two supplicants from the Regia Chapel in Padua, and at the knee of St. Peter in a 1345 panel by Vitale da Bologna, originally part of altarpiece of the Madonna dei Denti.¹⁴ The second figure is more enigmatic: he is a younger, blond man in a short, grey cowl-necked tunic, gathered at the waist, and with hose of the same colour. He might be identified as a contadino or poor man, as such a figure is paired with the pilgrim on Guariento's panel, although it has to be said he is not particularly humble or scruffy; perhaps they are just the clients served by the Hospital of S. Maria in which the fresco lay.

But perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the fresco is the donor shown at Mary's knee (fig. 52), a richly attired signore. He wears a tightly fitted surcoat with a pattern of sinusoidal waves of gold and dark blue (now almost black), gold knee patches, a prominent sword, and elegant shoes with long, pointed toes; an elaborate, gold-visored helmet, topped with an elephant head complete with floppy ears and tusks, is pushed back onto his shoulders, and seals his splendour. The donor's size distinguishes him from the other kneeling men, as does his extreme proximity to Mary; he is presented to her by one of the angels, whose hand rests on his head, and the gaze the Virgin directs down at the Child might just include him. More intriguingly, although the verse order of the "Gaude" was not fixed from one version of the hymn to the next, it always began "Gaude Virgo Mater," making the reading of the sequence necessarily begin with the angel presenting the knight, not only further underlining his prominence, but suggesting the Office of praise to her is

¹⁴Flores d'Arcais 67-70, who dates the Guariento to c. 1350; Rosalba d'Amico and Massimo Medica, eds., Vitale da Bologna (Bologna, 1986) 91-96.

generated by him or at least on his behalf. Finally, an inscription runs along the bottom edge of the fresco (figs. 58, 59); it is fragmentary at the right, but the words "A.D. M.CCC.LXXI. QUESTA. VOPERA. FECE. FARE. MS. FRANCESCO. SIGNIO(r)E...." can be made out fairly easily.

In 1371, "Francesco Signioe's" attire would have been appropriate and stylish at any court in Europe, but he is a rather unexpected figure to discover in fourteenth-century Pian di Carpine; while there are other Trecento images of elegant knights being presented to Mary, they are typically associated with the stylish courts of Naples, or the small but influential courts of the North, such as the Carrara at Padua, who employed Guariento, Guisto de' Menabuoi, and others creating both paintings and sculptures.¹⁵ Fortunately, as I will argue, the fresco itself allows Francesco to be identified very securely, and his tale to be told, a story in which the practice of war and Christian piety are intimately linked. The tale begins, however, with the history of fourteenth-century Pian di Carpine itself, a military town occupied by an Order of monks on a permanent crusade.

II. Magione and Military Men

In addition to its 1371 fresco, Magione has two other important medieval artifacts. The first is the palace fortress of the Knights of the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem or Knights Hospitaller, still one of the official

¹⁵Stella Mary Newton, *Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince: A Study of the Years 1340-1365* (Woodbridge, 1980) 53-64, and 86-87 for Italy; for court images with knightly donors at Naples: Bologna, *passim*; and for Padua: Margaret Plant, "Patronage in the circle of the Carrara Family: Padua 1337-1405" in Kent and Simons, 177-199, and "Portraits and Politics in late Trecento Padua: Altichiero's frescoes in the S. Felice Chapel, S. Antonio" *AB* 63 (1981) 406-425; and Diana Norman, "'Splendid models and examples from the past:' Carrara patronage of art" *Siena, Florence and Padua: Art, Society and Religion 1280-1400*, 2 vols., ed. Diana Norman (New Haven and London, 1995) I, 157-175.

residences of the Grand Prior of the Order; the present building (fig. 60) dates mostly from the fifteenth century, but incorporates remnants of an earlier fortress and chapel.¹⁶ This is in fact the "magione" which eventually gave the town its name, a fact that suggests how central it has been to the history of the place. The second relic is the huge Romanesque tower which overlooks the town and the surrounding countryside. This monument too has been linked to the Knights Hospitaller, who may have owned it or at least controlled it, although the exact nature of the tie is uncertain; its present name, Torre dei Lambardi or Lombardi, is supposed to derive from one Marcello Lombardi or Lambardi who was thrown from it to his death in 1688.¹⁷

As these two buildings suggest, the history of the Hospitallers is in many ways the history of medieval Magione itself: in fact, the earliest mention of Pian di Carpine, a document of 17 January 1209, is an act drawn up near the Order's "hospitale Planis Carpini."¹⁸ The Knights of St. John of the Hospital were created, like the Knights Templar, in the eleventh century, and combined two functions which may now seem mutually exclusive: they were an order of fully professed soldier monks who protected and sheltered pilgrims in the Holy Land, but quickly became a body of permanent fighters for the increasingly doomed and fruitless crusades.¹⁹ By the mid-Trecento,

¹⁶Ottorino Gurrieri, *Il Castello del Sovrano Militare Ordine di Malta a Magione* (Perugia, 1981). The magione was enlarged by the Bolognese architects Fioravante di Ridolfo and his son in the early Quattrocento, and now houses an important library of the Order.

¹⁷Very little is known about the history of the Tower, currently being restored by the Deputazione per l'Umbria. Riganelli 40 argues it formed part of the Hospitaller defense network, and notes it was described as being controlled by the friar Giovanni di Pero in 1384; Fabretti 9 says the Hospitaller *stemma* was painted inside it, but with no indication of date.

¹⁸This is the first secure reference, a donation of 17 January 1209, "actum in comitato Perusino, non longe ab hospitale Planis Carpini, in plano Quatrubiani iuxta stratam." *Regesta Chartarum Italiae*, vol 14: *Regesto di Camaldoli* (Rome, 1907) doc. 1459, 40.

they had turned their attention to the Turkish threat in the Mediterranean, instigating a series of attacks and half-hearted crusades in the fourteenth century.²⁰ They also had extensive holdings in Europe, foundations along the main pilgrimage routes created to encourage a flow of pilgrims, money, and men to the battles in the East.²¹

Pian di Carpine was a natural place for a settlement because the area was fertile, and the town lay along the ancient Flaminia, a convenient stop on the road to Perugia and the South; the Knights of Pian di Carpine were part of the Priory of Rome.²² There is no doubt the Trecento magione was an important settlement: it is recorded to have paid a decima of more than thirty-four Cortonese pounds in the 1332-1334 assessment, and in the fourteenth-century Perugian Liber beneficiorum, it was listed with another Hospitaller church, S. Cassiano, for eighteen hundred pounds.²³ More importantly, these

¹⁹For the Order: H.J.A. Hire, The Knights of Malta (New Haven and London, 1994); Anthony Luttrell, The Hospitallers of Rhodes and their Mediterranean World (Aldershot, 1992); Anthony Luttrell, The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece, and the West 1291-1440: Collected Studies (London, 1978); Mario Roncetti et al., eds., Templari e Ospitalieri in Italia: La chiesa di San Bevignate a Perugia (Milan, 1987).

²⁰Hire 14-15; 25-30.

²¹Hire 3, 101-111.

²²For the Flaminia: Gaetano Messineo and Andrea Carbonara, Via Flaminia (Rome, 1993); for the Priory of Rome: Giulio Silvestrelli, Le chiese e i feudi dell'ordine dei Templari e dell'ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme nella regione romana (Rome, 1917); Carlo Pietrangeli and Arrigo Pecchioli, La Casa di Rodi e i Cavalieri di Malta a Roma (Rome, 1981). Relations between the town and the Hospitallers were not always cordial: in the 1250s and 1260s there were a series of riots, and on at least one occasion the people attacked the magione, forcing the temporary expulsion of the prior: Riganelli 45-53. These events have been incorrectly linked to Sta. Maria delle Grazie by Bartoccioni (1968) and Ricci, who argue the fresco was in the church of a hospital run by Basilian monks, taken over at some point by brothers of the order of the "crociferi" and attacked in the 1260s. It will be clear the "crociferi" are the "fieri", i.e. the Hospitallers themselves, while the Magione foundation is described in a 1261 letter by Alexander IV as "locis et terris Hospitalis S. Basilii de Urbe," because it was a dependency of the Roman seat, S. Basilio al Foro di Nerva: J. Delaville Le Roulx, Cartulaire Général de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem (1100-1310), 4 vols. (Paris, 1897) III, doc. 2988.

²³RDI Umbria, entry 1026; for the Liber beneficiorum: Grohmann 864 nt. 42.

soldier-monks and their fortresses were the most notable and influential aspects of this middling-sized town.²⁴

More generally, however, the Hospitallers' fortresses, the *magione* and the tower, are also reminders of Magione's violent past: when the town is mentioned in medieval chronicles, it is as the victim of endless conflicts and invasions. Although subject to Perugia, Pian di Carpine lay in a contested zone at the edge of its *contado*; the Flaminia which brought pilgrims and goods was also the traditional invasion route from Tuscany, and the territory between Perugia and Lake Trasimeno had the highest density of fortresses in the fourteenth-century Perugian state.²⁵ Magione was a convenient base from which to attack the city, and saw major fighting in 1280, 1335, and 1352; it was also a favourite stop for mercenary companies, and in November 1364 the English Company camped there for over a week while the Perugians scrambled to buy them off.²⁶ Most importantly, however, between 1368 and 1371, the years immediately before the fresco of Santa Maria delle Grazie was created, Magione was again filled with soldiers as well as its usual Hospitaller military monks, because Perugia again at war, and with no less an opponent than its overlord, the Pope himself.

²⁴In the Perugian catasto of 1282 Magione had 180 "hearths," making it the third largest subject town of the quarter of Santa Susanna: Grohmann 671-672.

²⁵For medieval Perugia and *contado*, see Grohmann, who discusses the density of castelli on 627, and: Francesco Bonaini et al., eds., "Brevi annali della città di Perugia dal 1194 al 1352, da uno della Famiglia Oddi" and "Diario del Graziano," (covering 1309-1491) *ASI* 16.1 (1850); Pompeo Pellini, *Dell'Historia di Perugia*, 3 vols. (Venezia, 1664, Reprint, Bologna, 1970); Francesco Briganti, *Città dominanti e comuni minori nel Medio evo, con speciale riguardo alla Reppubblica Perugina* (Perugia, 1906); *Società e istituzioni dell'Italia comunale: l'esempio di Perugia (secoli XII-XIV)*; Congresso storico internazionale, 2 vols. (Perugia, 1988).

²⁶"Brevi annali Oddi" 57; "Diario del Graziani" 109-110 and 186, both *ASI* 16.1.

The roots of this conflict went back into the thirteenth century.²⁷ Although nominally subject to the pontiff, Perugia maintained a policy of territorial expansion within the Papal States throughout the Duecento and Trecento, gradually conquering surrounding cities, and the Avignon popes became determined to reclaim their territory.²⁸ Matters came to a head in 1368, with Perugia in open rebellion, and suspected of an alliance with Bernabò Visconti, arch-enemy of the Church; in August, 1369, Perugia was excommunicated, and on February 18, 1370, the Legate Anglic Grimoard (the Pope's brother) was ordered to preach the crusade against the Visconti and against Perugia: the conflict had become a Holy War, and the soldiers were now crusaders.²⁹ The papal forces sought alliances with every political power in Italy, including Johanna of Naples, the Este, Carrara, and the Gonzaga; when Perugia's traditional allies, Siena and Florence, refused their aid, at least partly due to fears of Visconti expansion, the outcome of the fight was a foregone conclusion. The last month of 1370 were spent drawing up the terms of Perugia's surrender, and on May 19, 1371, the papal vicar Pierre d'Estaing entered and took control of the city.³⁰ A massive fortress was built in the very centre of the town, and the Church set about recalling the many magnates who

²⁷Pietro Balan, La ribellione di Perugia nel 1368 e la sua sottomissione nel 1370 narrata secondo i documenti degli archivi vaticani (Rome, 1880); E. Dupré Theseider, "La rivolta di Perugia nel 1375 contro l'abate di Monmaggiore ed i suoi precedenti politici" BDSPU 35 (1938) 69-166; and Maria Pecugi Fop, "Il Comune di Perugia e la Chiesa durante il periodo avignonese con particolare riferimento all'Albornoz" BDSPU 65 (1968) 5-102.

²⁸Pecugi Fop 28-29; Dupré Theseider 75-78.

²⁹The excommunication: Dupré Theseider 79, nt. 2; the letter to Anglic Grimoard: Theiner, II, CCCCLXVII, 469-470. For the Grimoard family: Bernard Guillemain, La cour pontificale d'Avignon (1309-1376): Etude d'une société (Paris, 1962) 162-164.

³⁰Dupré Theseider 84.

had been exiled by the popular government, and rewarding those who had fought in its cause.³¹

It is not clear what the Hospitallers of Magione were doing during this conflict, but in August, 1370, the head of the Priory of Rome (and therefore of Magione), Gerardo da Perugia, was ordered to cede two of his fortresses near the city so they could be used by papal forces.³² Whether or not one of these was the Pian di Carpine magione, it is certain the town was caught up in the papal crusade: in 1370-71 the "fortress," probably the giant tower with its attached buildings, was occupied by seventy Perugian magnates, fuorusciti loyal to the Church and hostile to Perugia's popular government, who used it as a base to attack the city and its rulers, seizing the ambassador Perugia sent to mollify them in the March of 1371.³³

This then is the immediate background of the 1371 fresco: it was created in a town recently occupied by rebellious noblemen and soldiers, whose defining feature was the presence of a religious order devoted to a permanent crusade. At this point the identity of the fresco's kneeling donor becomes crucial to the tale.

III. Francesco Signore and the Aspirations of the Lesser Nobility

The knight at Mary's knee in the fresco has never been identified (fig. 52), and yet every aspect of the fresco works to make his status and his

³¹Pecugi Fop 92-102, and Dupré Theseider 84-166 discuss these later events.

³²Balan 20 and Pecugi Fop 90-91; unfortunately neither identifies the castles in question.

³³Riganelli 92-94; Pellini I, 1074-1075, who specifies the fuorusciti "entrato nascostamente nella Rocca chiamata allora dei Cavalieri di San Giovanni, & hoggi detta della magione, luogo del Priorato di Roma, non lungi dal piano di Carpana, & cacciatone subito quelli, che v'erano, per li padroni, vi mise le genti della Chiesa."

identity clear. The most obvious clue is the vernacular inscription (figs. 58-59), which I would decipher: A.D. MCCCLXXI QUESTA VOPERA FECE FARE M. FRANCESCO SIGNORE GENERALE D(i). CO(r)/TO(na), with the last letters added in smaller characters above the beginning of the same word. It seems clear, then, that is the only surviving image of Francesco di Bartolomeo Casali, who ruled Cortona from 1363 until his death in 1375.³⁴ Francesco's own clothing and helmet make this identification certain: his doublet is heraldic, and patterned with the gold and navy waves of the Casali family arms, "fasciato ondato, oro ed azzurro," while the elephant head of his helmet appears on family stemme in Cortona, as well as on the Casali Chalice created by the Sienese artist Michele di Tommè, and now in the Museo Diocesano of that city (figs. 61, 62); this last object is even inscribed "in tempore Francisci S. Cortone."³⁵

Crucially, Pian di Carpine lay in an area where Perugia and Cortona had long-standing territorial disputes: the second recorded reference to Pian di Carpine, dating from 1230, is in fact a pact of temporary friendship between the two cities, soon abandoned.³⁶ This brief alliance was atypical, and in both 1335 and 1352 Magione was burnt to the ground by invading armies of Tuscan nobles in reprisal for Perugian advances, the first time by the lord of Arezzo,

³⁴For Francesco: DBI 21, 79-80; Franco Cardini, "Una signoria cittadina 'minore' in Toscana: i Casali di Cortona" ASI 121 (1973) 241-255; Girolamo Mancini, Cortona nel medio evo (Florence, 1897) 212-221, and Litta II.

³⁵For the Casali arms: Litta II, and Piero Marchi, ed., Archivio di Stato di Firenze: I Blasoni delle Famiglie Toscane conservati nella raccolta Ceramelli-Papiani (Rome, 1992) 195, reference number 5336; "fasciato ondato" is illustrated in the appendices. For the chalice: Edouardo and Paolo Mori, Guida storico artistica al Museo Diocesano di Cortona (Cortona, 1995) 82-83.

³⁶The act was drawn up "in palatio hospitalis Plani Carpini." Attilio Bartoli Langeli, Codice Diplomatico del Comune di Perugia: periodo consolare e podestarile (1139-1254), 2 vols. (Perugia, 1983) II, 233-238.

with the assistance of Bartolomeo Casali, Francesco's father, and the second time by Bartolomeo himself.³⁷ Cortona was directly threatened by Perugia's expansionism, and as always Magione lay in the middle, vulnerable to attack from both sides.

Given these disputes, it is not surprising Francesco Casali supported the papacy in the war against Perugia. Despite his father Bartolomeo's attack on Magione, previous Casali campaigns had ended in defeat, and the crusade against Perugia therefore offered an ideal chance to humiliate his rival and to curb its threatening sprawl.³⁸ Furthermore, Perugia's mercenaries were led by John Hawkwood, another old enemy of the Casali state, and Francesco's brother-in-law, Rodolfo da Varano, was in 1370 the leader of the papal forces against them.³⁹ Not surprisingly, the Lord of Cortona was implicated in every stage of the rising conflict. When Urban V was making a last attempt to reach a peace treaty with Bernabò Visconti in 1368, one of those he contacted was the "nobili viro Francisco de Casalibus, militi Cortonensi, conservatori et gubernatori civitatis Cortonensis."⁴⁰ In February 1370, the Bishop of Cortona was among those ordered to preach the crusade against Perugia, and in July 1370 Urban asked that Francesco attack the enemies of the church.⁴¹ The precise nature of Francesco's intervention is uncertain, but it was obviously

³⁷"Diario del Graziani" ASI 16.1, 109-110, 157-158. For Bartolomeo, see DBI 21, 72-75.

³⁸DBI 21, 72-74 characterises Bartolomeo's campaigns as humiliating failures; in 1353 he was forced to offer a "palio" to Perugia's patron, S. Ercolano, in sign of his submission.

³⁹Balan 19; for Cortona, Hawkwood and other mercenaries, DBI 21, 79, and Mancini 214-216.

⁴⁰P. Lecacheux and G. Mollat, eds., Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V [1362-1370] se rapportant à la France (Paris, 1954) 490; the other addressees were Siena, Perugia, and Joanna of Naples.

⁴¹Balan 42, Document V for the order to the bishop; Mancini 217 for the Pope's request, sent to the government of Siena for reasons that will be made clear below.

successful, and ensured his reception by the Pope's appointee as Vicar of Perugia, Pierre d'Estaing, at the end of the hostilities.⁴²

Thus it is quite possible to see the Magione fresco as an assertion of Francesco Casali's newly-proven power in this hotly contested zone, with the conquering Francesco cozily ensconced at Mary's knee (fig. 51); in Cortona and elsewhere, churches and hospitals were often founded or embellished to commemorate military victories: the patron of Cortona, Mark the Evangelist, had himself been adopted after Francesco's ancestor Uguccio reclaimed the town from Aretine occupation on Mark's feast day in 1261.⁴³ And there can be no doubt the image's placement in Magione was an unavoidable reminder of Casali vindication, prudently executed in fresco so that the work might be scratched or covered, but could never be carried off, no matter how many times Pian di Carpine was sacked or occupied. Even Francesco's choice of the elephant head helmet as his heraldry can be read in this light (fig. 52): for although elephants were praised in medieval bestiaries as the strongest of beasts, making them attractive to would-be strongmen, it is just possible he had adopted it in memory of that other great conqueror, Hannibal, who also fought near the north shore of Lake Trasimeno in what was now Casali territory, in an area traditionally identified with Cortona's subject towns of Sepoltaglia and Ossaia.⁴⁴

⁴²Mancini 217; Pellini I, 1105.

⁴³For Mark: Alberto della Cella, Cortona antica: notizie archeologiche, storiche, artistiche (Cortona, 1900) 56; similarly, in 1277 Charles of Anjou founded two separate Cistercian house in fulfillment of a vow made in battle: Caroline A. Bruzelius, "'Ad modum franciae:' Charles of Anjou and Gothic Architecture in the Kingdom of Sicily" Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 50 (1991) 402-420.

⁴⁴For elephants in two Trecento bestiaries: Annamaria Carrega and Paola Navone, eds., Le proprietà degli animali: Bestiario moralizzato di Gubbio; Libellus de natura animalium (Genoa, 1983) 41, 298-301; for Ossaia: Guerriera Guerrieri, Cortona: piazze, strade, vicoli, rughe, e località extraurbane (Cortona, 1980) 94, and della Cella 46-49.

Moreover, commissioning the fresco as personal and seigniorial propaganda would be entirely in keeping with what might be expected of the Lord of Cortona, for in many ways, Francesco di Bartolomeo Casali is a perfect example of the minor but politically ambitious signore so typical of later Trecento Central Italy, the would-be military aristocracy who presided over small courts.⁴⁵ Francesco is typical of these men: his family rose to power by popular election in the 1320s, but thereafter they pursued an aggressive policy of advantageous marriages, and of buying, selling, and conquering both lands and titles. Francesco was related by blood or marriage to most of the family signorie of Central Italy, and had a network of powerful kinsmen: his mother was Bartolomea degli Ubaldini and his step-mother Beatrice Castracani, he married Chiodolina da Varano, daughter and sister of the Lords of Camerino, and his two sons, Niccolò Giovanni and Francesco II, married Alda da Polenta, daughter of the Lord of Ravenna, and Antonia di Agnolino Salimbeni, of the Lords of Tintinnano in the Val d'Orcia (and distant relatives of S. Galgano's would-be benefactor, Vanni Forgiasa).⁴⁶ Like the Casali, such families had precarious claims to nobility.

Above all, however, they wished to distinguish themselves from the often richer and more powerful merchants and bankers who formed the new urban elites, and one of the best ways to do so was to adopt the status and symbols of the older aristocracy's traditional military role.⁴⁷ Francesco himself

⁴⁵For these figures and their importance: Jean-Claude Maire Vigueur, "Comuni e signorie in Umbria, Marche e Lazio" Storia d'Italia 7/2: Comuni e signorie nell'Italia nordorientale e centrale: Lazio, Umbria e Marche, Lucca (Torino, 1987) 323-606; and Claudio Donati, L'idea di nobiltà in Italia, secoli XIV-XVIII (Rome and Bari, 1988).

⁴⁶DBI 21, 81-83; Litta II, Mancini passim; in addition his aunt Giovanna was married to a Count of Santa Fiore, his uncle Jacopo to a Montefeltro, his half-sister Raniera to one of the Prefects of Vico. For Antonia Salimbeni, see Salimei, Albero III.

held the titles of Signore Generale and Imperial Vicar of Cortona, and had been dubbed a Knight of the city of Siena, in an elaborate ceremony in that city; he was given gifts including a fine palace, and after three months of feasts, celebrations, and honours, he returned to Cortona as the leader of a garrison of armed men that Siena stationed there to reinforce Casali rule.⁴⁸ Yet this last relation is also undoubtedly a reminder of the Casali signoria's precarious position, again quite typical of their ilk: Francesco was in fact linked by accomandagia to Siena (and later Florence), in an essentially feudal form of alliance where, as the weaker party, he swore loyalty and service in exchange for the city's support and protection.⁴⁹ Even with this support, Casali rule would still collapse with Francesco's own son: this unfortunate young man, Francesco "Senese" (so-called because he was held at baptism by members of the Sienese government), was murdered in 1407, probably at his own nephew's behest.⁵⁰

⁴⁷Maire Vigueur 568-575; see also Franco Cardini, Guerre di primavera: Studi sulla cavalleria e la tradizione cavalleresca (Florence, 1992), and Quell'antica festa crudele: Guerre e cultura della guerra dall'età feudale alla Grande Rivoluzione (Florence, 1987); for a general introduction: Maurice Keen, Chivalry (New Haven and London, 1984).

⁴⁸The January 1358/9 dubbing of Francesco, his father, and his brother is recounted by the Sienese chronicle of Neri di Donato, RIS XV 135-294, 165-166. The family received a "palazzo e casamento, il quale è rincontra al Senatore," worth 720 gold florins, and remained in Siena until April, "con grande onore e trionfo e festa" in celebrations costing two thousand gold florins. DBI 21, 79 gives the year as 1360 for the dubbing.

⁴⁹Fabrizio Barbolani di Montauto, "Sopravvivenza di signori feudali: le *Accomandagie* dal comune di Firenze" I ceti dirigenti nella Toscana tardo comunale: Atti del III Convegno di studi (Florence, 1983) 47-55; on 47 this is defined as: "un'alleanza tra un potere maggiore che offre protezione e una potenza minore che ne accetta la tutela e le assicura fedeltà e partecipazione in caso di guerra, conservando piena o parziale autonomia." Cortona is listed from 1387 on 48, and in a pact of 1389 on 50. For Siena and Cortona, see also: Alfonso Professione, Siena e le compagnie di ventura nella seconda metà del secolo XIV (Civitanova Marche, 1898) 24-26, 39-43.

⁵⁰DBI 21, 60-62, 81-83, 100-102. When Francesco Casali died in 1375, he left a daughter, Bartolomea, and two sons, Niccolò Giovanni and the posthumously born Francesco Senese, probably about ten years younger than his brother. Niccolò Giovanni inherited, but died in 1384, probably aged less than twenty, leaving his own son, Aloigi Battista. Francesco Senese was then eight, and Aloigi one, so regents were appointed, and the two children sent to live

Yet even if it masked more uncomfortable truths, a military and a knightly pedigree were often central to the self-definition of these little princelings: like the image at Magione, the artworks they commissioned enshrined them in these roles, and they were expansive patrons, for such courts needed sophisticated means to justify and perpetuate their states, and visual art was crucial to creating and sustaining their claims to aristocratic status.⁵¹ Thus by the mid-fourteenth-century, even relatively minor aristocracy families might bury their sons depicted as knights in full armour on marble tombs.⁵² And a court such as the Carrara of Padua covered its churches with portraits of the rulers and their clients in the arms which denoted their station.⁵³

with the Salimbeni of Tintinnano. After Francesco's murder, Aloigi Battista Casali himself was deposed within two years, and the Casali dominion ended.

⁵¹Martin Warnke, *The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist*, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge, 1993), especially 6-18, 23-34. So important was this courtly patronage that Warnke argues the courts, not the city-states, were the real motors of artistic change in the late Trecento. Unfortunately, the debate on "court style," cannot be treated here in detail, but see: Julius von Schlosser, *L'arte della corte nel secolo decimoquarto* (Pisa, 1965); Enrico Castelnuovo, "Arte delle città, arte delle corti tra XII e XIV secolo" *Storia dell'arte italiana* V, 167-227; and most recently Richard Goldthwaite, *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy 1300-1600* (Baltimore and London, 1993). For an introduction to individual courts: Evelyn Welch, *Art and Authority in Renaissance Milan* (New Haven and London, 1995); Serena Padovani, "Pittori della corte Estense nel primo Quattrocento" *Paragone* 299 (1975) 25-53; Pierluigi Leone di Castris, *Arte di Corte nella Napoli Angioina* (Florence, 1986), and Ferdinando Bologna, *I Pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli, 1266-1414* (Rome, 1969).

⁵²Judith W. Hurtig, *The Armored Gisant Before 1400*, Ph.D diss., New York University (New York and London, 1979) 168-187; Lionello G. Boccia, "HIC IACET MILES: Immagini guerriere da sepolcri toscani del Due e Trecento" *Guerre e Assoldati in Toscana 1260-1364* (Florence, 1982) 81-99.

⁵³For the Carrara patronage, see Plant, and Norman (both as in nt. 15). The city states also adopted court models: thus the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena had Simone Martini's Maestà image of its "ruler," the Virgin Mary, at one end, Ambrogio Lorenzetti's lost Mappamondo at the other, and a series of battle scenes and personifications of virtues around its walls, elements which recall the arrangement of the Westminster chamber of Henry III and Edward I: Marcia Kupfer, "The Lost Wheel Map of Ambrogio Lorenzetti" *AB* 78 (1996) 286-310, 302; for the kings' chamber: Paul Binski, *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London, 1986).

In this too Francesco Casali was typical: he amassed a substantial fortune despite his rule's vicissitudes, and seems to have viewed the creation of art and architecture as integral to his glory and reputation.⁵⁴ Although little survives of his commissions, he is known to have enlarged the Casali palace and the Palazzo del Popolo of Cortona; he restored the walls and gates of the city, as well as the huge family fortress of Girifalco above Cortona, which the Casali had occupied since 1325, and another castle in the Valdipierle at the outer rim of his state.⁵⁵ Francesco and his court were also important patrons of religious works: the Casali chalice has already been mentioned (figs. 61, 62), and in 1375, the year of his death, Francesco succeeded in having S. Francesco of Cortona reconsecrated after a period of abandonment: his stemma with its waving bands is still visible on the church's facade, and he may also have had work done in the church's interior.⁵⁶ More intriguingly, in that same year, 1375, Francesco is recorded to have commissioned a fresco of the Madonna and Child, now almost entirely effaced, in the apse of the church of Santa Maria di Sepoltaglia, south of Cortona and close to the northern shore of Trasimeno, near the traditional site of Hannibal's famous battle: this opens the

⁵⁴There is no study of art under the Casali, but see Mancini, della Cella, and: Brevi notizie storiche riguardanti l'antichissima città di Cortona, ad uso specialmente dei forestieri (Fuligno (sic), 1827); Giovanni Girolamo Sernini Cucciatti, Quadri in chiese e luoghi pii di Cortona alla metà del Settecento, ed. Paul J. Cardile (Cortona, 1982) and Giancarlo Cataldi et al., Cortona struttura e storia: Materiali per una conoscenza operante della città e del territorio (Cortona, 1987).

⁵⁵Mancini 218 and DBI 21, 80. An inscription records that in June 1366 the Porta del Borgo S. Vincenzo was erected under him: della Cella 68-69. For the Castello in the Valdipierle: Bruno Frescucci, Il Castello di Pierle (Cortona, 1968).

⁵⁶For the exterior stemma: Mancini 221; Sernini Cucciatti 39 records a vernacular inscription within the church (currently closed for restoration) where Francesco is termed "PRINCIPE E SIGNORE FRA(N)CESCHO E VICARIO DELO IMPERADORE EN CORTONA." S. Francesco had been occupied by Fraticelli from 1285 to 1318; it was placed under interdict until 1329 and then remained vacant until its reconsecration: John R.H. Moorman, Medieval Franciscan Houses (St. Bonaventure, NY, 1983) 150-152.

interesting possibility that the image in Magione was only one of a series of Madonnas created by Francesco throughout the territory he claimed or sought to claim.⁵⁷

In fact, apart from the Magione fresco, there is one other Trecento representation of the Lord of Cortona, and it presents him as quite willing to conflate piety with more venal, earthly glory. In Novella CLVII of the Florentine Franco Sacchetti's Trecentonovelle, Francesco Casali is entertaining a Spanish guest, one Pietro Alfonso, and wishes to show how many rich and holy relics are found in his fair city.⁵⁸ Pietro is cheap and greedy, but he is also quick-witted, and as author's mouthpiece he gets all the best lines: thus when the Signore Generale tells Pietro that Cortona has the body of Saint Margaret, Pietro says he is not surprised, adding: "pare che sempre, dove hanno regnato i signori, vi siano assai corpi di santi, e specialmente martiri." The Spaniard is even less impressed when he realises the "saint" in question is not the famous martyr Margaret of Antioch, but the uncanonised laywoman Margaret of Cortona. Francesco then begins to praise the powers of another local saint, Ugolino, also of course completely unknown to his guest, and the next day shows him Ugolino's body, "nero pauroso con l'ossa scoperte." Not surprisingly, Pietro is frightened half to death, and begs Ugolino to leave him alone; he immediately takes his leave, telling Francesco

⁵⁷Bruno Frescucci, Le chiese cortonesi (Arezzo, 1983) 73-74 records the current church was once part of the castello of Sepoltaglia, which belonged to the Casali; in the apse "si conserva un affresco rappresentante la Madonna col Bambino, ridipinta nel secolo passato da un tale Marcucci ed oggi in precarie condizioni di conservazione." According to della Cella 225, there were two altars at the east end of the church; in "quello di destra vi è la nicchia ove è dipinta la Madonna col Bambino. La pittura è sopra un muro ricurvo ad abside, e non ha più nulla di antico essendo stata orribilmente ridipinta in tempi recenti da un tal Marcucci."

⁵⁸Franco Sacchetti, Il Trecentonovelle, ed. Antonio Lanza (Florence, 1984) 338-341.

he can keep Ugolino, and the tale concludes with a characteristic Sacchetti invective against new saints foolishly supported by modish signorotti.⁵⁹

There is some truth to Sacchetti's tale: both Margaret and Ugolino were in fact to be found in Cortona, and successive Casali lordlings did make sure both were honoured in suitable fashion.⁶⁰ Yet it is worth considering how different Sacchetti's tale might appear if told from Francesco's point of view: it is not necessarily true the Casali were motivated to support these saints only by foolish credulousness or the needs of family propaganda, despite Sacchetti's implications.

Similarly, I would argue it is a mistake to dismiss the fresco of the Madonna delle Grazie as a cynical statement of power. Such a view seems contradicted by the iconographic peculiarities of the image, and does not take due account of the models of devotion offered to small signori like Francesco Casali, especially when involved in a crusade. I would now like to discuss these models, and how they shaped the 1371 fresco: as an idealised image of Francesco as vassal to a perfect and powerful Queen, the painting was an appropriate expression of piety for the circumstances of its commission, for Francesco Casali himself, and perhaps even for Trecento Magione in general.

⁵⁹For whatever reason, Sacchetti was especially unimpressed by Cortona's saints: in a letter to Giacomo di Conte of Perugia, he repeated his diatribe against Margaret and Ugolino almost verbatim, including the motto "quia omnia nova placent." Franco Sacchetti, Opere, ed. Aldo Borlenghi (Milan, 1957) 1113-1119.

⁶⁰According to Sernini Cucciatti 42-46, when Margaret died in 1297, Uguccio Casali had the church of S. Basilio, where she had prayed, given to the Franciscans; the existing church was enlarged in her honour in 1297, as an inscription recorded. At the end of the Trecento, a convent of Clarissan nuns was created nearby by Francesco's descendents. According to the same author, 50-51, Ugolino was an Augustinian who died March 22, 1370; the recentness of his death must account for part of Sacchetti's scorn.

IV. Crusading, Casali, and the Madonna of Graces

When considering the Magione fresco, it is important to realise that, even in the later Trecento, the basic model of behaviour and devotion offered to knights and magnates such as Francesco was militant, even military, in nature and rhetoric. It depended on the doctrine of the Just War, first formulated by Augustine: this argued conflict was an unavoidable result of sin, and could even be sin's best remedy by punishing those who persisted in error, and thus that the soldier employed in a Just War was aiding God's work on earth, and serving Him in a prescribed manner as priests served him through their prayers.⁶¹ In a model sermon for a dubbing ceremony such as Francesco had undergone in Siena, the Duecento Dominican Master-General Humbert of Romans (1194-1277) suggested the new knight should be told those who fought in defense of the church were "milites dei," while bad knights belonged to the devil; the same writer suggested magnates in general should be exhorted to use their arms and power to defend the weak, care for the poor, protect churches, and drive the impious from their lands.⁶²

Military metaphors were also a feature of devotional literature for such men: when Catherine of Siena wrote to the condottiere Bartolomeo Smeducci of the Lords of San Severino Marche, she exhorted him to be "a courageous and fearless knight," strengthened with humility and charity, conquering the

⁶¹The primary source is Frederick H. Russell, The Just War in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1975); see also: W.J. Sheils, ed., The Church and War (Oxford, 1983) which includes R. A. Markus, "Saint Augustine's views on the 'Just War,'" 1-13. This definition of the correct role of the medieval warrior was integral to the tripartite division of medieval society, those who fight, those who pray, and those who work: Georges Duby, Les trois ordres ou l'imaginaire du féodalisme (Paris, 1978).

⁶²Humbert of Romans, Sermones ad diversos status (Hagenau, 1508) n. pag., but modern insertions, "Tractatus I, Sermo LXXXIII: Ad magnates"(28v-29r) and "Tractatus II, Sermo LXXXIII: In militia nova solenni"(68v-69r). For a discussion of Humbert's works: Edward Tracy Brett, Humbert of Romans: His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society (Toronto, 1984).

city of his soul and "clothed and armoured with virtue and the sword of hatred and of love;" she sent letters using similar themes to that erstwhile papal villain, Bernabò Visconti, among others.⁶³

Significantly, Catherine was seeking to persuade these men to join a crusade, a particularly justified kind of Just War: a soldier involved in a crusade was the apotheosis of the Christian knight, employing his strength for God's work against evil, and if the Papal States, for instance, were Christ's earthly kingdom and Peter's patrimony, anyone who sought to "usurp" them could only be anti-Christian, and therefore, a legitimate target for the knights of the Church.⁶⁴ Humbert of Romans suggested preaching of the King of Glory calling his faithful knights to defend "sancta mater ecclesia" against its heretic enemies.⁶⁵ In the crusade against Perugia, the rhetoric of papal and imperial documents was more dramatic: in stripping the Perugians of their vicariate, the Emperor Carl IV described them as "suggestione dyabolica, divini timoris obliti et honestis humanae conversationis moribus detrahentes" in their rebellion against "sanctam matrem Ecclesiam;"⁶⁶ and when Pope Urban ordered his brother the legate Anglic to preach the crusade, he referred to the "atroces culpas et excessus gravissimos," of the "hostium et persecutorum ecclesiae Romane, matris et magistre cunctorum fidelium;" and he urged the

⁶³Suzanne Noffke, ed. and trans., The Letters of Catherine of Siena, 2 vols. (Binghampton, NY, 1988) I, 158-162, and 67-72 to Visconti.

⁶⁴See in general: James A. Brundage, Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader (Madison, 1969), and for Italian crusades: Housely (1982) and (1986).

⁶⁵Humbert, "Tractatus II, Sermo LXIII: In predicatione crucis in genere" (61r-v); see also: Christoph T. Maier, Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century (Cambridge, 1994) 11-118.

⁶⁶Theiner, document CCCCLIV, 463-464; he elsewhere describes the Perugians' mercenary soldiers as "nephandum illam Sathane congregacionem Societatis Anglice." Document CCCCLXVI, 467-468.

"fideles Christi ad se defendendum virilius ab eisdem, qui humanitate deposita belvinam videntur rabiem contraxisse."⁶⁷

Perhaps it is no wonder, then, that the angels' Gaude list of Mary's honours seems to begin with Francesco himself. Their inclusion is both a reminder of Mary's own prerogatives and a perpetual evocation of Masses said in her honour, but if Francesco had been instrumental in the fight against Perugia, he had also added to the reasons why Mary-Ecclesia might rejoice. The attributes of the angels may support such a suggestion: within the work, the jar of the "Magi dona," the first instance of earthly kings honouring the Heavenly King, is echoed by the very carefully described tower, held by the angel of "honorem tibi pandis in coeli palatio" (figs. 52, 53); it is just possible a reference is intended to some more earthly palace tower which Lord Francesco had recently "presented" to Mary and her Son. The heavenly honour of the verse might even be something of a mutual reward; for if the Magione image was created in thanks for Francesco's military successes in the crusade against Perugia, it also served as a record of the occasion in which he had proved both his Christian piety as a knight of God, and his loyalty to Mary, the exemplar and the personification of "Sancta mater ecclesia;" she in turn had reason to be thankful.

This may also help explain the impression that Francesco is here pledging service to Mary, for in fact, his size, pose, and relative position are reminiscent of those used in contemporary images of rule and fealty. The best example is probably the illustration of the genealogy of the Anjou rulers of Naples in the Bible (fig. 63), now in Malines, produced by the Neapolitan artist Cristoforo Orimina around 1340: in this miniature, the Angevin kings

⁶⁷Theiner, document CCCCLXVII, 469-470.

and queens sit enthroned while smaller figures pledge their loyalty on bended knees. In the lower left of the image, for instance, two small princesses, the future queen Johanna and her sister Maria, are presented to Queen Sancia, while the Duke of Calabria kisses the hem of Sancia's husband, Robert. But the same scheme is also used to denote a conferring of authority or benefit: thus at the top of the page, while his wife Beatrice acknowledges the armoured knights at her right hand, Charles I crowns the kneeling Charles II, in an image undoubtedly derived from the most famous Trecento painting of a saintly transfer of power, Simone Martini's Saint Louis of Toulouse crowning his brother, Robert of Naples (Naples, Museo di Capodimonte).⁶⁸

As Julian Gardner has discussed, these images rely on postures and imagery that could be used in both sacred and secular settings.⁶⁹ They share the same visual language, and sacred and worldly notions of fealty and service overlap, with a potential slippage that might be very important for Francesco Casali's image. The slippage is all the greater at Magione because Mary's rule is stressed through contemporary regalia no less striking than Francesco's own (fig. 53): she wears a very large crown complete with Anjou fleurs-de-lys, an elegantly patterned cloak and dainty veil, and her Child is wrapped in a regal ermine fur backed by scarlet. Even the style of the image recalls such courtly precedents: the fresco shares the same type of elongated figures with long, thin faces, and the same stress on a richness of pattern and surface found in the Anjou miniature, or in the image of Robert of Anjou surrounded by rather angel-like Virtues in the same work (fig. 64).

⁶⁸For Cristoforo Orimina and the Malines Bible: Bologna 275-280; for the Simone Martini: Bologna 157-170; Martindale 192-194.

⁶⁹Julian Gardner, "Saint Louis of Toulouse, Robert of Anjou and Simone Martini" *ZfK* 39 (1976) 12-33.

This similarity is interesting in light of Francesco's 1375 will, which makes it clear that the Magione fresco is only the most striking vestige of what seems to have been Francesco Casali's particular devotion to Mary's cult. When he died, Francesco left a series of conscientious legacies to the churches of Cortona (including thirty gold florins for the chapel of Margaret of Cortona in S. Basilio), but he also made special arrangements specifically in the Virgin's honour: in addition to the revenues from a property near Arezzo for a priest to say masses in S. Maria di Sepoltaglia, "ad honorem Beatae Virginis pro anima ipsius testator," he left bequests to the confraternity of S. Maria of Cortona, and the Servi di Maria of the city, as well as money for two pilgrims to visit both the "Madonna di Ponte d'Oro, Com. Castelli" and the "Madonna di Montevergine of S. Nicholas of Bari," every year for ten years.⁷⁰

The first Madonna is not easy to identify, but the second must indicate the foundation of Montevergine in Anjou Naples, founded by the hermit Guglielmo of Vercelli in 1126 and supported by the Angevin rulers; there were in fact two famous Madonnas at this site, a panel of the Madonna and Child Enthroned by Montano d'Arezzo, and the "Madonna di S. Guglielmo," painted in the first half of the Duecento, and said to have been brought from the older church of S. Nicholas in Bari.⁷¹ This work, Francesco's favoured painting, is an image of the Madonna nursing the Child (fig. 65), in which

⁷⁰I have unfortunately not seen the original copy of Francesco's will, only the transcription given in F. Alticozzi, "Storia della famiglia Casali" Biblioteca comunale di Cortona, ms. 442 (540) 126r-127v, 148v-162r, and his summary 142r-147v. The bequests mentioned are at 143r, 150v, 151r-v. The bequest to the Servites might be considered one of Francesco's "duty" bequests to the religious foundations of the town; it received five florins for masses, as did S. Domenico, S. Agostino, while the Franciscans got ten.

⁷¹Placido Mario Tropeano, Montevergine nella storia e nell'arte: periodo normanno-svevo (Naples, 1973) 25-26 for the Madonna; see also Giovanni Mongelli, Storia di Montevergine e della Congregazione verginiana, 8 vols. (Avellino, 1965); for Montano d'Arezzo and his work: Bologna 102-107; Leone di Castris 197.

Mary is shown with a very prominent crown against a large circular halo, and a richly pattern cape and gown. She holds the Child who nurses from a breast just below her neckline with his small feet crossed; He wears a light-coloured garment under a wrap, and has a relatively prominent round cruciform halo.

Obviously, the Madonna of Pian di Carpine is not a straight-forward copy of the Madonna of Montevergine: the change of the Child from Mary's right to left side is only the most notable difference. But there are definitely common features in the two works, and it is just possible the image at Magione was intended at least as an evocation of the distant and older Madonna. Perhaps Francesco even wished to thank the Virgin of Montevergine, rather than simply the Virgin in general. This makes the inclusion of Eve (fig. 55) in this image of Marian praise and fealty doubly intriguing, and it is time to turn to this figure before concluding the discussion.

V. Eve and Indulgences

At Magione Eve's portrayal has changed notably from the Sienese images at S. Galgano or Montefalco. She is more elegantly attenuated and more upright, possibly to gain her a greater prominence despite her relatively smaller size and lower position, but she also has three somewhat conflicting attributes. She is shown with the snake whispering into her ear; again, as at Cleveland, it is female-headed because "like attracts like" and thus the snake must have appeared as a young woman to speak with its victim. Furthermore, Eve's scroll has a direct quotation from Genesis to underline her guilt, "Serpens decepit me et comedi," and she holds the incriminating branch in the other hand. Yet as if to counterbalance these elements, she has also acquired a lozenge-shaped halo, and even perhaps a small, blunt cap or crown; the

feature also occurs in panels attributed to the Sienese artists Paolo di Giovanni Fei (figs. 84-86) and Niccolò di Buonaccorso (fig. 87), to the Lucchese Angelo Puccinelli (fig. 88) and Giuliano di Simone (figs. 89, 90), and to the Florentine Master of the Straus Madonna (fig. 92).⁷² Such haloes were relatively common in Central Italy; they could be used for virtues, beati, or to indicate one of the elect who had predeceased Christ, in which case they normally implied the eventual reception of the figure into the ranks of the Elect, delayed until Christ's death and descent into Limbo.⁷³ As such, Eve's halo seems to counterbalance the more active depiction of her fall, as she is the first to act "suggestione dyabolica" like those Francesco had helped to overcome; the image stresses temptation but also the grace of redemption brought through Mary.

It is difficult to know what types of religious sources Francesco Casali might have known to encourage him to include Eve. He was literate at least in the vernacular, and might therefore have known some vernacular texts, such as the penultimate canto of Dante's Paradise, for instance; by 1371 the poem was already relatively well known throughout the Italian peninsula and a favourite of the cantastorie who entertained both in cities and at courts.⁷⁴ Here Eve appears in the Mystic Rose of Mary's court with her descendants, including Rachel, Sarah, Rebecca, and Judith:

⁷²See the Appendix, n. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 for these works.

⁷³Mark J. Zucker, "The Polygonal Halo in Italian and Spanish Art" Studies in Iconography 4 (1978) 61-78; John Osborne, "The Portrait of Pope Leo IV in San Clemente, Rome: A Re-examination of the So-called 'Square Nimbus' in Medieval Art" Papers of the British School at Rome 47 (1979) 58-65.

⁷⁴For the Commedia's spread: Francesco di Pretoro, La Divina Commedia nelle sue vicende attraverso i secoli (Florence, 1965); Michael Caesar, ed., Dante: the Critical Heritage, 1314(?) - 1870 (London and New York, 1989); for local cantastorie and their material: M. Catalano, "Il Romanzo di Perugia e Corciano" BDSPU 27 (1924) 41-15.

quella ch'è tanto bella da' suoi piedi
è colei che l'aperse e che la punse.⁷⁵

One of Petrarch's Rime in honour of the Virgin, "Vergine bella, che di sol vestita," also includes a traditional reference to Eve:

e fra tutti 'i terrenti altri soggiorni
sola tu fosti eletta,
Vergine benedetta
che'l pianto d'Eva in allegrezza torni (...) ⁷⁶

There is no proof Francesco knew either of these works, but he might well have been familiar with the Laude of S. Francesco in Cortona, the church reconsecrated through his efforts, and one of these also mentions Mary and Eve:

Ave vergene gaudente,
madre de l'Omnipotente(...)

Fosti l'eska, e Cristo l'amo
per ciu fo difiso Adamo
perké ad Eva pres'è el camo
del freno ke fo tagliente(...) ⁷⁷

Yet these sources are very traditional, and imply nothing more than the typical understanding of Mary undoing Eve's work, and thereby saving her and others, making Eve a good reminder of Mary's story and power. But perhaps Eve should simply be understood as the highest possible attribute of praise to Mary, the one with the most reason to thank the Madonna of Graces: it seems clear Casali was seeking every possible means to sing Mary's praises, and Eve's inclusion would be an obvious choice, especially if Casali had a spiritual

⁷⁵Charles S. Singleton, Paradiso, 3 vols. (Princeton, NJ, 1973) I, Canto XXXII. For a c. 1445 illustration of this canto with Eve at Mary's feet by Giovanni di Paolo (fig. 83), see the Appendix.

⁷⁶Francesco Petrarca, Rime, Trionfi e Poesie Latine eds. F. Neri et al. (Milan and Naples, 1951) CCCLXVI, 472-477.

⁷⁷Guarnieri, ed., (as in nt. 1) 67-72.

advisor of his own to help him, for instance, with the Latin verses of Mary's office.

There may be a more pointed reason: Francesco and Eve both had their sins counteracted by Mary-Ecclesia. Those, like Francesco, who helped a crusade were entitled to indulgences, and thereby automatically restored to a state of innocence; Bernard of Clairvaux claimed the sign of the cross placed on a devout crusader's shoulder ensured him entry to the kingdom of God.⁷⁸ This was true in the war against Perugia: those who fought or supported the Church with money were entitled to the indulgence.⁷⁹ Thus both Eve and Francesco were restored to grace through Mary, although it seems more likely that Eve's inclusion was simply a further invocation of Mary's power and honour.

In any case, there is no doubt the image Francesco had created was an fitting expression of piety for Trecento Pian di Carpine, not only because of the town's turbulent history. In fact, the Knights Hospitaller seem to have favoured similar compositions to mark their devotion: there is an image of John the Baptist presenting a Hospitaller donor to the Virgin in Santa Cristina, Bolsena, where the white cross of the Order is clearly visible on the patron's shoulder; and Hospitaller patronage has also been suggested for Pietro Lorenzetti's detached fragment of the Baptist presenting a knight to the Madonna and Child, in S. Domenico in Siena, dated to the 1320s (fig. 66).⁸⁰ This congruence is not surprising: Hospitallers were often drawn from same minor aristocracy as the Casali and their ilk, and shared the same models to

⁷⁸Brundage 149-151.

⁷⁹For the Perugia indulgence: Theiner, document CCCCLXVII, 469-70.

⁸⁰Carlo Volpe, *Pietro Lorenzetti* (Milan, 1989) 194-195; P.P. Donati (1969) 3-17.

express their faith.⁸¹ In fact, Francesco's half-brother, Ranieri, was a Knight of Saint John, and while there is no way of knowing whether Ranieri had links to the knights of Magione in the early 1370s, this coincidence suggests another shadowy reason why Francesco Casali might have chosen Magione for his work.⁸²

Unfortunately, unlike Sacchetti's novella, there is no clear end to this tale, the vicissitudes of the Casali regime, as with so many similar signorie, having destroyed most of their history and documentation. In the final analysis, there is no proof Casali troops captured or occupied Magione in the war, and there may have been a more personal reason for the Lord of Cortona's thanks to Mary. Eve can also of course be seen as an attribute of Mary's overarching power to intercede, delivering her and others from death; this association has already been seen in Piero di Puccio's fresco for the Pisa Camposanto (fig. 47). More specifically, however, Original Sin as the cause of death was almost invariably mentioned in the sermons which came to figure at aristocratic funerals: the model sermons of Jacques de Vitry, and Gilbert de Tournai explained that Adam and Eve's sin had passed death to the flesh of their descendants as a birthright, and that only Christ's death assured the final resurrection; Giovanni of S. Gimignano discussed the link while preaching on the death of an emperor, as it was discussed at in a funerary sermon for Edward I of England.⁸³

⁸¹For Hospitallers as lesser landed gentry: Luttrell, "The Rhodian Background of the Order of St. John on Malta" in Luttrell (1992, as in nt. 19) 4.

⁸²See Litta II for Ranieri Casali.

⁸³D.L. D'Avray, Death and the Prince: Memorial Preaching before 1350 (Oxford, 1994) 29 for Jacques de Vitry, 35 for Gilbert de Tournai, 161 and 169 for Bertrand de la Tour's sermon at Edward I's death, and 162 nt. 16 for Giovanni da S. Gimignano. It will be recognised Giovanni is essentially restating Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 15, which lay at the root of the pairing of Christ and Adam and later Mary with Eve.

In 1371 these themes might not have been so far from Francesco Casali's own mind: in June of 1371 there was an unsuccessful attempt on his life, led by his own uncle, which he only narrowly escaped.⁸⁴ It is possible, therefore, that Francesco's creation of the fresco was motivated by this very personal calamity, expressing his thanks to Mary for her intervention on his behalf.

VI. Conclusions, and a Note about S. Severino Marche

Thus if no specific reason can be offered for Francesco Casali's wish to include Eve at his Lady Mary's feet, the inclusion does show that by the 1370s the iconography was known among the laity, albeit of a certain status, and perceived as one of the strongest ways in which to honour her. But, as a Sienese image, it may also have expressed Casali's own dual political aspirations, as a military leader dependent on a city-state for his power, and as a small signore dependent on courtly models developed elsewhere to express his status and desires. Francesco might have known the iconography from his Sienese ties, which it would then embody: he had spent several months in the city when dubbed a knight of the Commune, he owned a castle at Bibbiano in its contado, and a palazzo in town; he had Sienese officials at his court, and his son was held by Sienese citizens at baptism.⁸⁵ And within Cortona there was apparently a well-established, and undoubtedly diplomatic, tradition of employing Sienese artists, who could also have passed on the iconography;⁸⁶ it

⁸⁴DBI 21, 79; Mancini 218-219.

⁸⁵The palace is mentioned in his will, Alticozzi 158v; and at least one Sienese court member was a witness, Francesco's doctor, Senso del fu Stefano of Santa Maria della Scala: Alticozzi 162r, Mancini 221.

is significant, perhaps, that the work most similar to the Magione fresco in iconography is the panel attributed to Paolo di Giovanni Fei of the 1370s (fig. 84), where the portrayal of Eve is especially similar.⁸⁷

But the Magione fresco was not done by a Sienese artist: in this case it seems Francesco sought a painter familiar with an idiom of heraldry and pattern, and with a visual language somewhat reminiscent of the style associated with the Anjou court. This must have been a deliberate choice, especially if a reference to Montevergine was intended. In any case, it does suggest a patron and perhaps an audience familiar with a variety of visual models and desiring to emulate them, as well as fully able to understand the resonances of feudal loyalty and service within the Magione work, a painting which commemorated both Casali's devout chivalry, and the service and emblems of military nobility at the heart of his own persona.

Before leaving Magione, however, it is worth asking briefly whether the patronage of the Madonna delle Grazie fresco allows any conclusions about the potential audiences of other works juxtaposing Mary as the Queen of Heaven with Eve. Can the iconography be linked to certain type of patron, perhaps those who, like Francesco, wished to define their status through military action and courtly codes? Or does the iconography tend to arise in contexts where devotion is linked, either conceptually or practically, with a Christian notion of battle and struggle?

⁸⁶As mentioned, the Casali chalice was created by a fourteenth-century Sienese artist; in the Museo Diocesano there are also two sculpted Sienese Madonnas of c. 1305, fresco fragments of the Carrying of the Cross, c. 1335, a Madonna and Child by Pietro Lorenzetti, another attributed to Niccolò di Segna, and two Crucifixes. See Mori and Mori for these works. In addition, della Cella 133 records that Barna and perhaps Ambrogio Lorenzetti may have done paintings in the vaults of S. Basilio-S. Margarita.

⁸⁷See Appendix, n. 1.

Certainly such associations were potentially present at Cistercian S. Galgano, and perhaps in Montefalco, seat of an embattled papal government. But the iconography of the majority of these works does not seem to support such a link: most of the saints in these images are the popular saints of Central Italy, above all John the Baptist.⁸⁸ It is true that several of the surviving images of Mary with Eve include military saints: Michael is included in Cleveland (fig. 1) and in the panel formerly in Livorno (fig. 91), and armed saints stand by in Cleveland (George?) and Stalybridge (Julian the Hospitaller, fig. 92).⁸⁹ But these rare examples do not form a pattern.

Yet there is at least one other painting which lends some support to a seigniorial link. In the Pinacoteca at S. Severino Marche, there is a large fresco fragment of Eve (fig. 67), datable to the beginning of the Quattrocento and ascribed to the local school. The Eve is almost exactly the same as the Montesiepi and Montefalco compositions, if slightly more slender and elegantly dressed; clearly either the patron or the artist had prior knowledge of one of these or an essentially identical lost work.⁹⁰

⁸⁸John the Baptist is the most popular saint in these paintings, and appears in six works (figs. 12, 37, 84, 88, 89, 92). John the Evangelist appears in five (figs. 12, 37, 84, 86, 87), Peter in five (figs. 12, 84, 86, 87, 90), and Paul in three (figs. 12, 84, 87). As mentioned in Chapter Two, these four saints were prominent in Sienese Maestàs by Duccio, Simone Martini and their followers, and their presence in works by Sienese artists is not unexpected; other Sienese saints including Bartholomew also appear in more than one image. John's popularity is also explained because he was chosen as patron by such disparate institutions as the Knights Hospitaller and the Comune of Florence. Most paintings include female saints: Catherine, who appears in four works (figs. 84, 85, 88, 89) seems to be the most common, perhaps partly because she had a fairly well defined iconography which makes her easier to identify than other women.

⁸⁹Julian's presence may seem significant, especially since he is paired in Stalybridge with John the Baptist and James the Great, patron of pilgrims, but Julian was not in fact primarily a Hospitaller saint, and popular throughout Tuscany: see Kaftal (1952) 593-601.

⁹⁰Mario Moretti and Pietro Zampetti, *S. Severino Marche: Museo e Pinacoteca* (Bologna, 1992) 87; Grondona 172. The fragment is 200 x 111 cm, and EVA is still visible under the figure, although no words remain on the scroll she holds.

This fresco was taken from S. Francesco al Castello, now demolished, a church closely linked to the Lords of S. Severino, the Smeducci: S. Francesco lay in the shadow of the family's tower, and its 1263 enlargement is traditionally ascribed to Nuzio Smeducci.⁹¹ Although the family's territorial expansion was limited by more successful families such as the Montefeltro, the Trinci, and especially Francesco Casali's in-laws the Varano, they had a small court, and like their peers they sought advantageous marriage alliances; their sons became signori, knights and military leaders and their daughters married others like them, and one of their number, the famous soldier Bartolomeo, received letters from Catherine of Siena.⁹²

The existence of what was presumably a very large Mary/Eve composition in a church at least loosely linked with this signoria may again suggest we are faced with works appealing to a certain type of patron and primary audience, perhaps associated with small courts or at least minor aristocracy. To strengthen this hypothesis, however, it will be necessary to find some evidence for it in our remaining work, which, it has to be said, does not immediately seem to be linked to such a context: the triptych formerly of the convent of Sant'Aurea in Rome.

⁹¹For S. Francesco: Raoul Paciaroni, "I primi insediamenti francescani nel territorio di S. Severino Marche" Beato Rizzerio ed il Francescanismo nel Camerinese, Atti del Convegno di Studi (Macerata, n.d.) 49-69; for S. Severino in general: Orietta Rossi Pinelli, "San Severino Marche" Storia dell'arte italiana 3/1 165-195; Miscellanea Settempedana, 2 vols. (S. Severino Marche, 1976).

⁹²Lorenzo Fiacchini, "Gli Smeducci della Scala Signori di San Severino," Università degli studi di Urbino, Facoltà di magistero, corso di materie letterarie. Relatore Ch.mo Prof. Raffaele Molinelli, anno accademico 1975-76; see also: Litta, Supplemento III, (who is unconvinced of Nuzio's role in S. Francesco), and Maire Vigeur, 568-574.

CHAPTER FIVE

VIRGO MATER MULTARUM VIRGINUM: A TRIPTYCH FOR THE CONVENT OF SANT'AUREA

tentazion del diavol vien più spesso
colà dov'ello vede star la gente
acconcia per poter a Dio servire.
-Francesco da Barberino (c.1318-1320)¹

The last object to be discussed is a large triptych of the Madonna and Child with Saints Dominic and Aurea (fig. 68), dated 1358 and signed by the Sienese painter Lippo Vanni, one of the most important artists working in Siena in the decades after the Black Death.² This triptych is in fact the only panel of Mary with Eve with a secure provenance: it can be traced back to the former Dominican convent of S. Aurea in Rome, once located near Campo dei Fiori.³ When S. Aurea was suppressed in 1514, the nuns were transferred to the convent of S. Sisto Vecchio, and in 1575 this combined community moved to Ss. Domenico e Sisto; although the last nuns left at the beginning of this century and the buildings are now the seat of the Università Pontificia Tommaso d'Aquino, the triptych is still there.⁴

¹Francesco da Barberino, "D'ognuna ch'è rinchiusa in monastero a perpetuo chiusura" Reggimento e costumi di donna, ed. Giuseppe E. Sansone (Turin, 1957), 159-160.

²First published by F. Mason Perkins and G. De Nicola, "Alcuni dipinti di Lippo Vanni" Rassegna d'arte senese 6 (1910) 39-41; see now: Un'antologia di restauri: 50 opere d'arte restaurate dal 1974 al 1981 (Rome, 1982) 20-23; and Sharon Dale, Lippo Vanni: Style and Iconography (Ann Arbor, 1985) 16-17 and 96-102; Schiller 193, Berenson (1968) 442-444; Guldan 134; Esche 61, nt. 179; Toesca 595-596; Edgell 150; Van Marle II, 456-458.

³Pio Pecchiai, La Chiesa dello Spirito Santo dei Napoletani e l'antica chiesa di S. Aurea in via Guilia (Rome, 1953); Alberto Zucchi, Roma domenicana. Note storiche, 3 vols. (Florence, 1938) I, 131-153. In the Dominican archives at S. Sabina, there are sixteen surviving Trecento and Quattrocento documents from the community: Archivium Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum (AGOP) XII, 9002 buste 66-81 and 9003 busta 123; they are listed by Zucchi 152-153; Pecchiai 147-161 gives abbreviated transcriptions.

Thus Lippo Vanni's panel is the only painting of Mary with Eve at her feet which can be linked with certainty to a female religious house, and it raises the complicated issue of cloistered women's relations to the iconography. Having discussed a variety of exclusively male worshippers, the monks of S. Galgano, the clerics of the Papal States, and the secular magnate Francesco Casali, these Dominican nuns and their relations to Mary and Eve are the focus of this final chapter. To explore these links, this last case study will introduce Aurea and her triptych, before presenting the convent setting, and the expectations raised by convents in general and S. Aurea in particular. It will then discuss how the juxtaposition of Mary and Eve might have been considered appropriate for such a setting, and it concludes with what is known about those who supported and commissioned works for the community, the only indication of the potential audience for the painting. And despite first appearances, it will be argued the nuns of S. Aurea were never the primary audience of the work, and that the panel should be seen as a idealised representation of the community, shaped by the hopes and fears of its governing Dominican friars and their clients. And when considering these clients, there is once again some evidence for the type of patron we have discovered for other Eve/Mary images, the minor to middling nobility.

⁴Virginia Bernardini, Andreina Draghi, Guia Verdesi, *Ss. Domenico e Sisto* (Rome, 1991); Joachim-Joseph Berthier, *Chroniques du monastère de San Sisto et de San Domenico e Sisto à Rome, écrites par trois religieuses du même monastère, et traduites par un religieux dominicain*, 2 vols. (Levanto, 1919-1920). These were written by Pulcheria Carducci (mid-Seicento), Domenica Salomonina (1656-1672), Anna Vittoria Dolara (died 1827), and Tomasa Angelica Pannilini, (died c. 1919).

I. Sant'Aurea and the Triptych

Aurea is the patron saint of Ostia, and her feast is celebrated on August 24.⁵ But like many virgin martyrs, she is a confused and shadowy figure, no doubt because, according to the Acta Sanctorum, her corrupt and inconsistent legend conflates several different saints' martyrdoms: even her name is a type of fabrication, for in the oldest, Greek sources, she is called Chryse, hence Aura or Aurea in Latin.⁶

According to the version of her legend current in Trecento Rome, however, Aurea was a third-century noblewoman of that city, martyred for her faith with several of her converts.⁷ This legend relates that Aurea was denounced for her faith and brought before the Emperor Claudius; but despite repeated tortures, she refused to renounce Christianity, and Claudius finally banished her to a property she owned in the port city of Ostia. There she lived with a group of holy companions, under the pastoral care of the saintly bishop Cyriacus, and she continued her works of mercy assisted by a priest named Maximus.⁸ Together, these saints performed several miracles, including restoring an artisan's dead son to life, and many Ostians were converted. But when Claudius learned of these events, he sent the vicar Ulpinus Romulus to the port to seize the saint and her companions; once again, Aurea and the others were tortured but they persevered, and when the Romans attempted to

⁵AASS augusti IV 755-76; see also Agostino Amore, I martiri di Roma (Rome, 1975) 220-222; and Kaftal (1965) 123-124.

⁶AASS 756.

⁷This account relies on her medieval liturgy: AHMA XIX (1895) 73-74; XXXVII (1901) 120; XLIII (1903) 86; and XLVa (1904) 36-37.

⁸These names are given in the AASS, but not in Aurea's office.

burn them to death, the saints were miraculously unharmed by the flames. The clerics were finally decapitated, and Aurea was thrown into the sea with a millstone attached to her neck. Her body was retrieved by a follower and buried, traditionally at the site of the Ostian basilica of Sant'Aurea, now an elegant Renaissance church.⁹

Since both Aurea's pre-Renaissance basilica and Roman convent are no more, Lippo Vanni's 1358 triptych is in fact the most important record of Aurea's medieval cult, with the only surviving cycle from her legend in its wings (fig. 68). It is a large work, 159 x 208 cm, and recent restorations have confirmed it is in good condition, with only small paint losses at the bottom of each wing and some losses in the joints of the centre panel; and although the frame is now bare, it was once adorned with coloured "gems" of paste or glass.¹⁰ Each wing has two scenes from Aurea's legend, rendered in a bright palette of pinks, blues, yellows, and sea greens: at the top left (figs. 69, 70), Claudius presides from his palace window as Aurea, stripped to the waist, is hung at the left side of the scene and scourged at a column on the right. Below this is the miraculous resuscitation of the artisan's son (fig. 71), again with two different narrative moments shown: at the right, the tradesman mourns as his son lies dead in a bedroom above the shop, and at left Aurea, Bishop Cyriacus,

⁹For Aurea and Ostia: Russell Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1973) 518-531; for the present church: Christoph Luitpold Frommel, "Kirche und Tempel: Giuliano della Roveres Kathedrale Sant'Aurea in Ostia" *Festschrift für Nikolaus Himmelmann: Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Hermeneutik*, eds. Hans-Ulrich Cain et al. (Mainz am Rhein, 1989) 491-505; Silvia Danesi Squarzina, "La qualità antiquaria degli interventi quattrocenteschi in Ostia Tiberina" *Ricerche sul '400 a Roma: Pittura e architettura*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1991) I, 111-153.

¹⁰*Restauri* 20: the triptych was restored in 1972 and 1976. According to Berthier I, 271-272: "Le cadre de ce "tabernacolo" était orné de nacre, de perles, de grenats, de pierres bleues, incrustées avec art, au milieu de feuilles et de fleurs en or. Mais avec le temps, il avait beaucoup souffert et la Mère Girolama Conti [ob. 1650] en fit dorer tout l'encadrement, comme on le voit encore aujourd'hui." This decoration is corroborated by the findings of Luisa Mortari, "L'antica Croce dipinta della chiesa romana dei SS. Domenico e Sisto" *Studi in onore di Giulio Argan*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1984-1985) I, 11-27, 18 nt. 13.

and the priest Maximus pray as the boy is resurrected.¹¹ In the other wing (fig. 72), the top scene shows the same three saints saved from the flames as Ulpinus Romanus looks on from his palace window; two soldiers with SPQR on their shields shy away as the flames turn against them.¹² The final scene takes place beyond the pink city walls of Ostia; Aurea is thrown into a green circle of sea, but washes up on the shore at the very bottom of the image, the string of the millstone still visible around her neck.

In the central panel (fig. 73), the Madonna and Child are seated against a cloth held by two angels. Mary turns her head to look out at the worshipper, supporting the upright Child, and at their right hand, Dominic is shown with a red book and a stem of lilies. Aurea stands at the other side, in a brocade dress with a heavy red stole, and a jeweled diadem on her hair; this figure is more slender and elegant than the small saint in the simple blue dress shown in the wings. She is holding a large vase, and both she and Dominic are neatly labeled at their feet (DOMINICUS and SCA AURA). Between them, Eve sits on the lower step (fig. 74); her blond hair is loose, her arms and legs are bare, and she is clad in a length of greyish fur. Below her is a predella-like lower zone with three figures (fig. 75): Thomas Aquinas (fig. 76), holding a open book with the first words of his Summa Contra Gentiles ("Veritatem meditabitur guttur meum et labia mea detestabuntur impium"), Christ as Man of Sorrows, and Bartholomew with a large knife and a closed book with a red binding. Finally, an inscription runs along the edge of the gradino steps: LIPPUS VANNIS DE SENIS ME PINXIT SUB A.D. MCCCLVIII (fig. 74).

¹¹Both Berenson (1968) 442-443 and Restauri 20 identify the shop-keeper as a tailor; the AASS calls him "sutor," not "sartor;" Kaftal (1965) 123-124 mentions both possibilities.

¹²It is possible both torture scenes refer to the same episode, with either Claudius or Ulpinus Romanus presiding in both cases.

It is often suggested Lippo Vanni trained with the Lorenzetti.¹³ Yet in many ways Vanni's panel of the Virgin with Eve at her feet is the least similar to the composition at Montesiepi, despite the fact it is probably chronologically closest to it apart from the Montefalco fresco; Vanni's painting is notably unlike later panel examples as well, even those by other Sienese artists. In no other work is there such an exaggerated hierarchy of figure size, so that in reproduction this large triptych seems like a small votive altarpiece. And the Eve is unique (fig. 74): she is a tiny, doll-like figure among the towering saints, seated with her back to the viewer, rather than reclining and facing out. She has also lost the fig branch, scrolls, and haloes of other images, but the snake who accompanies her has become very much larger.

These changes must be significant, because Vanni clearly knew and used Sienese models for other aspects of the work. Dominic and the figures of the predella recall those of the great Dominican polyptych by Simone Martini for S. Caterina in Pisa (fig. 77), which also features a Man of Sorrows in the predella centre (fig. 78), and includes similar figures of both Bartholomew and Aquinas, the latter even holding a book with the same words from the

¹³Lippo Vanni (or Lippo di Vanni) is first documented as a miniaturist, and a series of important illuminations and small panels have been linked to his early period, as well as a reliquary from Santa Maria della Scala. His later works at Siena include the 1363 Battle of the Val di Chiana in the Palazzo Pubblico, and a 1372 Annunciation in San Domenico; he is also known to have painted a Coronation of the Virgin in the Sala della Biccherna in 1352, and unspecified works in the Sala del Consiglio in 1359. He sat on the Consiglio Maggiore of the city in both 1360 and 1373. For Vanni, in addition to Dale, see: *Il Gotico a Siena*, 246-249 and 255-275; William Suida, "The Altarpiece of Elzbieta Lokietkowna" *GdBA* 33 (1948) 201-208; Lidia Vertova, "Lippo Vanni versus Lippo Memmi" *BM* 112 (1970) 81-87; Cesare Brandi, *Un candelabro dipinto da Lippo Vanni* (Berne, 1975); Carlo Volpe, "Su Lippo Vanni da miniatore a pittore" *Paragone* 321 (1976) 53-54; Miklòs Boskovits, "A dismembered polyptych, Lippo Vanni, and Simone Martini" *BM* 116 (1974) 367-376; Ulrich Middeldorf, "Two Sienese Prints" *BM* 116 (1974) 1048; Cristina di Benedictis, "I corali di S. Gimignano III: Le miniature di Lippo Vanni" *Paragone* 321 (1976) 67-78; Henk van Os, "A Choir Book by Lippo Vanni" and "Lippo Vanni as a miniaturist" *Studies in Early Tuscan Painting* (London, 1992) 314-330 and 331-343; and Valerie Wainright, "Late Illuminations by Lippo Vanni and his Workshop" *Pantheon* 46 (1988) 26-36.

Summa.¹⁴ More importantly, the settings of the scenes of Aurea's legend are in fact based on those of the miracles of St. Nicholas of about 1330 by Ambrogio Lorenzetti himself, now in the Uffizi, underlining that Vanni was well acquainted with Lorenzetti's work even beyond their native Siena.¹⁵ And he also seems to have been aware of the frescoes at Montesiepi, at least by the 1360s: in his paintings at the Augustinian hermitage of San Leonardo al Lago near Siena, the Annunciation is closely modeled on the San Galgano composition.¹⁶

It might be argued Vanni simply had difficulty with the scale and execution of the commission: he is documented first as a miniature painter, and might therefore have exaggerated the differences in figure scale. Or perhaps he needed models for every aspect, and the one for Eve was not (yet) in his repertory. The use of two different prototypes might explain why the two Aureas are so unlike, for instance, and why a vase was chosen as her attribute: perhaps, as a vessel to hold water, it was intended as a reference to her death by drowning, but it might also be that here and throughout the work she is simply another saint in disguise.¹⁷

Yet by 1358 Lippo Vanni was probably the most important artist in Siena, and presumably capable of a large triptych commission, with or

¹⁴See Martindale 198-199; this painting is discussed further below.

¹⁵For the link to the Lorenzetti: Restauri 23; for the painting: Luisa Marcucci, I Dipinti toscani del secolo XIV: Gallerie Nazionali di Firenze (Rome, 1965) 161-163.

¹⁶Enzo Carli, Lippo Vanni a San Leonardo al Lago (Florence, 1969); Alberto Cornice, "San Leonardo al Lago: Gli affreschi di Lippo Vanni" Lecceto e gli eremi agostiniani in terra di Siena (Siena, 1990) 287-308; for the Montesiepi Annunciation as model for Vanni and others: Freuler (1986) 33-48, 108.

¹⁷For the vase: Restauri 21; the scenes of Aurea's martyrdom could have been adapted from models close at hand: Saints Clement, Pantaleone, Cristina, and Biagio had all been tortured and drowned with millstones around their necks, and all were venerated in Rome itself: Kaftal (1965) 20-226, 280-282, 301-308, 837-845; and Kaftal (1952) 201-210, 261-266, 281-284.

without precedents; as an explanation this is not sufficient.¹⁸ Furthermore, it seems the distinction must have been willed between the two Aureas, the small figure in blue in the wings and the regal central saint, for among the other three surviving paintings of her, one of them is normally attributed to Vanni himself. This is a small reliquary triptych in Baltimore (fig. 79), a Virgin and Child flanked by John the Baptist and Aurea, with Dominic and three other saints in the wings.¹⁹ In this case, unlike the 1358 work, Vanni did rely on the only surviving earlier image of Aurea, a triptych by Duccio in the National Gallery, London (fig. 80) in which she again appears with Dominic: these two Aureas are similarly attired in pink gown with light veil, and the pose of Madonna and Child is very close.²⁰

It seems likely, then, that the iconographic and compositional peculiarities of the 1358 triptych, including Eve's size and position in relation to the Virgin, might be attributed to choices made either by the artist or the patron(s), and that possible reasons for them should be sought in the context of the work. One reason might lie in the slippage between the ideal and the

¹⁸This judgment is given by Wainwright 27 and nt. 130.

¹⁹The International Style: The Arts in Europe Around 1400 (Baltimore, 1962) 38-39; Federico Zeri, Italian Paintings in the Walters Art Gallery, 2 vols. (Baltimore, 1976) I, 44-46. The attribution to Vanni was first made by Bernard Berenson, "Due nuovi dipinti di Lippo Vanni" Rassegna d'arte 17 (1917) 97-100; but Dale 24-25 gives the Baltimore work to a figure she calls the "Second Master of Sant'Eugenio."

²⁰Jill Dunkerton et al., Giotto to Dürer: Early Renaissance Painting in The National Gallery (New Haven and London, 1991) 220-221; David Bomford et al., Art in the Making: Italian Painting before 1400 (London, 1989) 90-97; Martin Davies, The Earlier Italian Schools (London, 1972, 1986) 171-173. The similarity of the two works was pointed out by Wainwright 35 nt. 4. The Duccio work is too early to have been created for the convent; these writers suggest it was created for the Sienese Dominican Niccolò da Prato, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia in the early Trecento. I have found one other image, a fresco in S. Domenico in Gubbio, from the middle of the Trecento: Enrica Neri Lusanna, "Percorso di Guiduccio Palmerucci" Paragone 325 (1977) 10-39, fig. 8a, as "Pittore eugubino della metà del Trecento; Toscano I, 346, as "eugubino con diretti influssi senesi" of c. 1340.

reality of the community of S. Aurea, and thus I would now like to discuss briefly the convent and the nuns themselves.

II. S. Aurea and the Friars

In 1358, the same year Lippo Vanni signed his triptych, the Dominicans drew up a list of convents under their direct jurisdiction: there were 157, of which forty were in Italy.²¹ According to the Dominican historian William Hinnebusch, the average female community had about fifty nuns, which means that in the year the triptych was painted there were almost eight thousand Dominican nuns in Europe, and perhaps something like eight hundred in the Roman province alone.²² But there is a paradox in these numbers. While the fourteenth century is the apogee of saintly women, especially in Italy, the characteristic Trecento holy woman is not, with some notable exceptions, a cloistered nun; the lives of these women are only beginning to be researched and explored, and in many ways the nuns of S. Aurea and their thousands of sisters are more veiled to us than they were to their contemporaries.²³

It is not known exactly when the community of Sant'Aurea was created; a legend reported in the seventeenth century claimed the original

²¹ Angelus Maria Walz, Compendium historiae ordinis praedicatorum (Rome, 1930) 248.

²² William A. Hinnebusch, The History of the Dominican Order I: Origins and Growth to 1500 (New York, 1966) 377, 383.

²³ The body of literature on late medieval and early Renaissance female piety is immense and growing. For a good introduction: Daniel Bornstein and Roberto Rusconi, eds., Women and Religion in Medieval and Renaissance Italy, trans. Margery J. Schneider (Chicago and London, 1996); Movimento religioso femminile e francescanismo nel secolo XIII: Atti del VII convegno internazionale (Assisi, 1980); and Roberto Rusconi, ed., Il movimento religioso femminile in Umbria nei secoli XIII-XIV: Atti del convegno internazionale di studio (Florence and Perugia, 1984).

community was founded by Aurea's followers in her Roman villa after the saint's death.²⁴ But the convent is not listed among the churches of Rome known as the Anonimo Torinese, compiled around 1314, and although it does appear in a list of Dominican convents in the Roman Province compiled in 1320, the name was apparently inserted at a later date.²⁵ Some scholars have argued for a date not long after 1320, to account for this insertion, but this may be too early: S. Aurea is not mentioned among the many bequests in the 1340 will of a Dominican cardinal from the area, and the first secure mention of it comes only in 1348, when the fabbrica received a bequest from a will.²⁶

The convent stood in the heart of Trecento Rome, near the Campo dei Fiori, in the "via magistralis" or main road, renamed via Giulia when Julius II refashioned it in the sixteenth century.²⁷ The convent was surrounded by many other churches and monasteries, in an important commercial area known as the "Castro" or "Campo" Senese," probably because a Sienese colony had

²⁴Berthier I, 293, 297. In some accounts, the nuns of this first foundation joined the first Roman Dominican convent, S. Sisto, when it was founded in 1221, and S. Aurea was subsequently refounded by sisters of S. Sisto in the Trecento: Berthier I, 271, Zucchi 138, and Ottavio Panciroli, Tesori nascosti dell'alma citta di Roma (Rome, 1625) 758. For Rome in general: Eugenio Duprè Theseider, Roma dal comune di popolo alla signoria pontificia 1252-1377 (Bologna, 1952); and Robert Brentano, Rome Before Avignon: A Social History of Thirteenth-Century Rome (London, 1974).

²⁵Giorgio Falco, "Il catalogo di Torino delle chiese, degli ospedali, dei monasteri di Roma nel secolo XIV" ASRSP 32 (1909) 411-443. According to Walz 248, between 1303 and 1358 five convents were added to the Dominican Roman province, one of which was presumably S. Aurea, but unfortunately he provides no names. The Trecento Decima records for Rome are lost, if indeed they ever existed: RDI Latium 5.

²⁶Matteo Orsini, OP, from the Orsini of the nearby Campo dei Fiore, left bequests to local churches including S. Barbara alla Regola, and S. Salvatore del Campo, and to Dominican convents in Bologna, Perugia, Florence, and elsewhere, yet made no mention of S. Aurea: Stefano L. Forte, "Il Cardinale Matteo Orsini OP e il suo testamento" AFP 37 (1967) 181-262. For the 1348 will: Umberto Gnoli, Topografia e topomastica di Roma medioevale e moderna (Rome, 1939) 66-67; this bequest will be discussed below.

²⁷For this area: Ceccarius, Strada Giulia (Rome, 1940); Luigi Salerno et al., Via Giulia: una utopia urbanistica del '500 (Rome, 1973); Carlo Pietrangeli, ed., Guide Rioni di Roma: Rione VII Regola, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Rome, 1973-1979).

settled to trade there.²⁸ Unfortunately, almost nothing now remains of Trecento S. Aurea, as it was replaced by the present church of Spirito Santo dei Napoletani in the later Cinquecento.²⁹ It was probably quite a small foundation: it is described in a 1368 document as bound on one side by the orchards and possessions of the "Domini de Andreoctinis," with the Tiber behind, "via mediante," and public roads on the remaining two sides.³⁰ A glimpse of it is given in a 1593 map of Rome, where, despite the label T(emplum) Spiritus Sancti, the old church of S. Aurea is shown (fig. 81): the church, oriented toward the Tiber, is slope-roofed and unvaulted, in accordance with Dominican legislation, and the convent buildings would seem to be those along the liturgical north side.³¹

S. Aurea can never have held many nuns. A 1383 document lists ten sisters;³² while a document of 1413 lists eleven women, specifying they represent the will of at least two-thirds of the community. These were mostly local women; several, those with names such as Alessi and Rufini, were

²⁸For medieval churches in the city, see Gnoli (1939), and: Mariano Armellini, Le chiese di Roma dal secolo IV al XIX, 2 vols. (Rome, 1942); Christian Huelsen, Le Chiese di Roma nel medio evo: Catalogo ed appunti (Florence, 1927); For churches still extant: Walter Buchowiecki, Handbüch der Kirchen Roms, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1967). For the Campo Senese: Pecchiali 5-6, and Ceccarius 18.

²⁹For Spirito Santo: Pecchiali, Buchowiecki III, 920-926; Oreste Ferdinando Tencajoli, Le chiese nazionali italiane in Roma (Rome, 1928) 103-108; and Luigi Lancellotti, La Regia Chiesa dello Spirito Santo dei Napolitani (sic) in Roma (Naples, 1868). S. Aurea's former presence is recalled by the via S. Aurea across from Spirito Santo's facade.

³⁰AGOP XII, 9002, busta 69 (Pecchiali 149).

³¹Stefano Borsi, Roma di Sisto V: La pianta di Antonio Tempesta, 1593 (Rome, 1986), I2; Restauri 21 accepts the identification. There is no study of Dominican convent architecture to aid a further reconstruction, but for male foundations: Gilles Meersseman, "L'Architecture Dominicaine au XIIIe Siècle: Législation et Pratique" AFP 16 (1946) 136-190; and Joanna Louise Cannon, "Dominican Patronage of the Arts in Central Italy: the *Provincia Romana*, c.1220-c.1320," Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1980, 52ff.

³²AGOP XII, 9002, busta 72 (Pecchiali 150); busta 71 is a copy of the same document, but lists only four nuns.

probably the daughters of local families of the minor or middling Roman aristocracy, and this is not surprising: most nuns tended to come from notable families of lesser wealth, or important families fallen on (relatively) hard times.³³

According to Saint Dominic's original conception of his second order, the nuns of S. Aurea were to live completely withdrawn from the outside world, dividing their time between the religious office, private prayer, and activities such as needlework or manuscript copying; they were subject to a strict rule, based, like that of the friars, on that of St. Augustine, with male friars to oversee them.³⁴ The nuns' main task, however, was to offer continuous prayers for the success of the preaching mission of the Dominican friars, who seldom had enough time to pray themselves because of their extensive activity among the laity; thus there may have been converse or lay-sisters to do the more menial jobs.³⁵

Much of this was very traditional. Yet partly because of the Mendicants' own early history, the early Dominicans and Franciscans sought

³³AGOP XII, 9002, busta 77 (Pecchiai 151-152); the names are Elena de Potenza, priorissa, Magdalena de Transtiberim subpriorissa, Catherina de Pistorio, Benedicta de Benedictinis, Paolotia Cole dello Mastro, Romanella de Monte, Caterinotia Iohannis Vecchi, Ceccha de Rufinis, Lippa ser Stephani, Honufria Lelli Alexii, Rita Philippi Raputi. For the background of nuns: Richard Trexler, "Le célibat à la fin du Moyen Age: Les religieuses de Florence" Annales ESC 27 (1972) 1329-1350, 1338-1339.

³⁴For nuns in general: Edith Pásztor, "Il monachesimo femminile" Dall'eremo al cenobio: la civiltà monastica in Italia dalle origini all'età di Dante, ed. Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli (Milan, 1987) 153-179; Clemente de la Serna Gonzalez, ed., Mujeres del absoluto: el monacato femenino, historia, instituciones, actualidad (Burgos, 1986); Michel Parisse, Les nonnes au Moyen Age (Le Puy, 1983); Micheline de Fontette, Les religieuses à l'âge classique du droit canon (Paris, 1967); and Gene Adam Brucker, "Monasteries, Friaries, and Nunneries in Quattrocento Florence" in Verdon and Henderson 41-62. For the Dominicans: Hinnebusch, 377-415; de Fontette 89-127.

³⁵Edith Pásztor, "I Papi del Duecento e Trecento di fronte alla vita religiosa femminile" Il movimento religioso femminile (as in nt. 23) 29-65, 54-55; for Dominican converse: de Fontette 107; Trexler 1336.

to impose a more rigorous cloister for the nuns than had previously been the norm: they could not afford the scandal of female followers roaming the streets, and even the radical St. Francis seems to have considered the only possible vocation for St. Claire as a type of anchorite isolation.³⁶ Thus at S. Aurea as elsewhere, every care was taken to minimise contact between the convent and the world outside: a rotating wheel between the cloister and the public space allowed any communications to be scrutinised and controlled, and convent choirs were carefully hidden behind walls and iron grilles.³⁷ Even the friars themselves could not enter the cloister unaccompanied by others, and convent business was to be done through appointed procurators.³⁸ The ideal solution, from the friars' point of view, was to isolate the convent itself, separating the nuns from the world, as was epitomised in Dominic's 1221 foundation of S. Sisto, placed at the safe distance of 2.5 km from the centre of Rome; even here, however, Dominic took no chances, retaining the nuns' keys as they entered their new home, forbidding them to speak to outsiders, and appointing lay brothers to watch over their enclosure.³⁹

This stress on cloister brought several potential problems in its wake, not least that even the most exemplary holy women seem to have viewed it as

³⁶Caroline A. Bruzelius, "Hearing is Believing: Clarissan Architecture, ca. 1213-1340" *Gesta* 31/2 (1992) 83-91, 84; Jeryldene Wood, "Perceptions of Holiness in Thirteenth-Century Italian Painting: Clare of Assisi" *AH* 14 (1991) 301-328.

³⁷As mentioned, there is no study of Dominican convent architecture, but see Bruzelius for wheels and choirs; the location of the choir at Sant'Aurea is described in a document of 1368 as "iuxta et prope altare magnum;" and it is specified it had an iron grate: AGOP XII 9002 busta 69 (Pecchiai 149).

³⁸Hinnebusch 393-394.

³⁹Brenda M. Bolton, "Daughters of Rome: All One in Christ Jesus" *Women in the Church*, eds. W.J. Sheils and Diana Wood (Oxford, 1990) 101-115; Pásztor; de Fontette 95-99; V. J. Koudelka, "Le *Monasterium Tempuli* et la fondation dominicaine de S. Sisto" *AFP* 31 (1961) 5-81. S. Sisto would become the home of the Aurea nuns when their convent was suppressed in 1514.

only one aspect of their wider vocation. Thus Claire of Assisi was chastised on several occasions for leaving her convent to beg as Francis had done, and the Augustinian Claire of Montefalco was also reported to have begged alms in the streets.⁴⁰ Inevitably, many Trecento nuns may have been less committed to their vocations than these illustrious abbesses, especially perhaps since in most cases the decision to take the veil had made for them by their fathers while they were still children.⁴¹

Perhaps not surprisingly, the Dominican friars spent much of the thirteenth century seeking to divest themselves of any responsibility for female houses, though to no avail; convents were always a potential problem.⁴² S. Aurea could also have been a focus of concern, located as it was between the busy Tiber and a main road at the heart of medieval Rome. Like any convent, it had some dealings with the world around it. In 1402, for instance, when a "Domina Leonarda uxor condam Nutii Cecchi Gratiani," left a house and property to the community, her will specified she lay ill "in camera dormitorii" of S. Aurea itself, suggesting professed nuns were not always the only women within its walls.⁴³ Such a relation was innocent, even laudable, but others were not: in the early Quattrocento, apparently acting independently of the friars, the nuns happily received a unknown man who came knocking one day at

⁴⁰Rosalind B. Brooke and Christopher N.L. Brooke, "St. Clare" *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford, 1978) 253-273; Pásztor 60.

⁴¹Trexler 1338-1341; but for a somewhat different view: Anthony Molho, "*Tamquam vere mortua*: Le professioni religiose femminili nella Firenze del tardo medioevo" *Società e storia* XII/43 (1989) 1-44.

⁴²Hinnebusch 387-393; convents could also be a financial burden.

⁴³AGOP XII 9002 busta 76 (Pecchiali 151); the witnesses were a notary, "fratre Laurentio de Cynchiis priore," and "fratre Laurentio Iacobi Cappelle de Roma," both of the main Dominican church in Rome, S. Maria sopra Minerva.

their door, and lost fifty gold ducats to him in the bargain.⁴⁴ And recorded offenses multiplied in the final years before the convent's 1514 suppression: there were warnings to the nuns not to leave the cloister nor to allow anyone to spend the night, and one sister Nufria, evidently a repeat offender, was not to be allowed to re-enter the convent without explicit permission; worse still, in both 1497 and 1499 a sister from S. Sisto was imposed as prioress and the reigning prioress "excused."⁴⁵ In fact, it has been suggested S. Aurea's final suppression was brought about by its lax relations with the outside world.⁴⁶

Whether or not this is true, as a convent S. Aurea was already a potential worry; there was a constant need to survey and control the relations between the public and cloistered space. The implications of this concern for the imagery of the triptych should now be explored, but to do so, it is necessary to know something of the work's intended audience, and above all who might have seen it in the first place. Thus the first task of interpretation is to establish where the panel was located.

III. The Triptych and the Community Beyond the Cloister Grille

⁴⁴In 1425 a man came to S. Aurea, calling himself Antonius Pauli of Montebufalo, and explained there was a treasure hidden in the monastery. To find it, the nuns needed to give him fifty pieces of gold, which would be sealed in a jar and buried; the buried gold would attract the hidden gold like a magnet, and he would return a month later to dig it up. When he failed to reappear, the nuns dug up the jar, and found lead had been buried in it, and the gold was gone: Pecchiali 18-22; letter transcribed 152-154. In fact, the belief was widespread in the Middle Ages that "Golden Rome" was built on buried treasure: Brentano 74-75.

⁴⁵Zucchi 141-142; Pecchiali 30-31.

⁴⁶Zucchi 141-144; it should be remembered, however, that the area around the convent was being recreated as the via Giulia, and it is possible S. Aurea was no longer prestigious or powerful enough to merit a place in this new urban space. For events after the move: Zucchi 145-147; Pecchiali 27-37.

Earlier, a 1368 document was mentioned describing the topographical location of S. Aurea. There are in fact two documents, drawn up the same day with the same witnesses, and they concern a bequest for an altar.⁴⁷ In the first, the "Magnificus vir" Francesco, Count of Anguillara, and his mother, the Countess Francesca, declare they have four hundred gold florins to create a chapel and altar in the church; the money was to be given on behalf of Agnese, widow and executrix of Pucciarelli Pucii Bovis, of the lords of Tolfa Vecchia, according to Pucciarelli's wishes. The second document recorded that Domina Agnese wished this altar to be constructed for the soul of her deceased husband, and then specified:

domina executrix predicta cum voluntate infrascripte domine priorisse et omnium aliarum monialium dicti monasterii elegit singnanter altarem et locum altaris intus dictam ecclesiam, videlicet in respectu gratis ferree dicti monasterii iuxta et prope altarem magnum Sancte Auree, per quam gratem dicta domina priorissa et moniales valeant habilititer et ex aspectu oculorum videre et aurire canere missam et canere et celebrare divina officia et alia sollempnia que requiruntur facere in aliis altaribus consecratis aliarum ecclesiarum.⁴⁸

Now in 1368, when Agnese made her bequest, Lippo Vanni's 1358 triptych had presumably been at S. Aurea for ten years.⁴⁹ Thus if the nuns wanted to use the bequest to create an altar of their own, it seems clear Vanni's work was not within clausura or visible from the iron grille of their choir, and that the triptych lay in the public section of the church.

⁴⁷AGOP XII 9002 buste 68 and 69 (Pecchiali 148-149).

⁴⁸Busta 69 (Pecchiali 149); the document is rubbed in places but legible.

⁴⁹Because of the coincidence of the 1358 date of the triptych and the 1368 date of the bequest, it is sometimes wrongly claimed Lippo Vanni's work was the one created for the nuns; see for instance Berthier I, 271-272 and 293-294.

For a number of reasons, it is perhaps most likely to have sat on the "altarem magnum Sancte Auree" mentioned in the document, making it invisible from the nearby iron grille, and not only because it is the only work securely connected to the Trecento community, and large enough to have been the main altarpiece in a small church, as S. Aurea must have been. More importantly, in several respects its form and iconography recall high altarpiece precedents in other Roman and Dominican churches.

Initially a triptych form might seem unusual for such a placement, but the backs of the wings do not seem to have been painted, which may suggest it was normally not expected to be closed, as it was visually prominent.⁵⁰ And there are important precedents for winged triptychs on high altars: in Rome itself the icon of the Sancta Sanctorum may originally have possessed wings, as later copies suggest, and even the Stefaneschi altarpiece, which Julian Gardner has argued stood on the high altar of St. Peter's, was a triptych in form, with "wings" that had become fixed.⁵¹ Moreover, such triptychs may have been very common: according to Klaus Krüger, the oldest Italian altarpieces were Madonna panels, normally triptychs, which invariably sat on the high altar or at least the main altar consecrated to Mary in a given church.⁵²

⁵⁰Unfortunately, the triptych is now fixed to a wall, but Restauri 23 makes no mention of painting on the wing backs, stating only "a tergo vi erano due robuste traverse fisse originali tarlati...ma ancora perfettamente efficienti." For winged altarpieces in general: Donald K. Ehresmann, "Some Observations on the Role of Liturgy in the Early Winged Altarpiece" AB 64 (1982) 359-369; and Mojmir S. Frinta, "The Closing Tabernacle - A Fanciful Innovation of Medieval Design" Art Quarterly 30 (1967) 103-117.

⁵¹Julian Gardner, "The Stefaneschi Altarpiece: A Reconsideration" JWCI 37 (1974) 57-103, 72-73 and 79.

⁵²Klaus Krüger, Der frühe Bildkult des Franziskus in Italien: Gestalt- und Funktionswandel des Tafelbildes im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1992) 17-30.

The Vanni work would correspond to this model, but one would normally expect scenes from the Life of the Virgin and Christ in the wings (figs. 69-72). Instead, the artist seems to have combined a Madonna triptych with a related tradition, the standing saint flanked by scenes of his or her legend. Again according to Krüger, these paintings, like the Marian images, were often triptychs, and also typically placed either on the high altar of the saint's titular church, or on the saint's own tomb or shrine.⁵³ Yet there are precedents for Vanni's fusion: in S. Lucia in Melfi, for instance, there is a Trecento fresco of the saint flanking the Virgin and Child, with scenes from her legend beside her.⁵⁴ Even at Melfi, however, this fresco was directly behind the high altar, which might therefore suggest the format was used for the main altar of S. Aurea as well; the rather unusual compression of the two traditions could then be a result of limited resources to meet several different votive needs.

Furthermore, Vanni's triptych has links to Dominican high altarpieces elsewhere. As Joanna Cannon has shown, the Dominicans seem to have encouraged a continuity in their imagery and altarpieces; the high altar typically had the head of their Order, the Madonna, pictured with her Child at the centre, flanked by Dominic and other saints of the Order, and saints associated with the city or particular church.⁵⁵ This description might fit many

⁵³Krüger 65-70 traces the early development of this tradition. A surviving work in Aquila can be used as an example: it has a standing Catherine of Alexandria (sculpted in this case), flanked by six painted scenes of her martyrdom, and probably comes from the Convent of St. Catherine in that city. Both the statue and panels are attributed to anonymous local masters from the first half of the Trecento: Mario Moretti, Museo Nazionale d'Abruzzo nel castello cinquecentesco dell'Aquila (Aquila, 1968) 26-27.

⁵⁴Krüger 85.

⁵⁵See Cannon (1980), and the same author's "Simone Martini, the Dominicans, and the Early Sienese Polyptych" JWCI 45 (1982) 69-93.

Trecento polyptychs, but if Vanni's painting is compared to Simone Martini's influential polyptych for Santa Caterina in Pisa, mentioned above, the links become more specific: the portrayal of Dominic, Bartholomew, Thomas Aquinas, and the central Man of Sorrows in the predella are all very similar (figs. 77, 78), and even the two images of the Virgin and Child are not unlike, while the verse identifying Thomas is in fact exactly the same.⁵⁶

It therefore seems possible Vanni's work was intended to integrate S. Aurea into the family of the Order, and in a manner sanctioned by the Order, at least on a reduced scale: Dominic and Aurea represent their community to the Virgin, its head (fig. 73), while the predella saints serve to link S. Aurea to both the Dominicans' own history, and an older tradition of Christian martyrdom, through their visual and conceptual links to the figures immediately above them. Thomas of course shares Dominic's habit, and both hold books as an indication of learning; Bartholomew wears a undergarment of a fabric similar to Aurea's dress, and this also perhaps suggests a link, as the two martyrs shared the same feast day, August 24. At the centre, Christ as Man of Sorrows is linked to Eve and the Virgin and Child, and this central placement of the Man of Sorrows was also appropriate as a eucharistic image. And the scenes of Aurea's steadfastness in the wings were not only illustrative, but also a reminder of the example she set for her followers, a sort of illustrious pre-history of the foundation: Aurea's Trecento office stressed she herself had died as a steadfast "bride of Christ," and her distinct portrayal in the central image, regal and serene at Christ's hand, perhaps underlined the success of her struggle.⁵⁷

⁵⁶For these details: Martindale 198-199; Cannon (1982) 71-73.

⁵⁷*AHMA* XLVa (1904) 36-37, which mentions, for instance: "Christi sponsa/nobilis, Aurea," and "Ad beati/sponsi praesentiam/Transit sponsa/per aquam nimiam"(!).

These visual stresses would have been relevant no matter where in the public church the painting stood, but they do suggest an awareness of Roman and Dominican images and precedents elsewhere, as well as a fairly detailed knowledge of potential links among the saints and their feasts. If the first could conceivably come from the artist, the second seems to point to the influence of someone with a more thorough religious culture, and this impression is borne out by the inclusion of Eve at Mary's feet. As in any image, Eve might serve as an attribute of Mary's glory and power, and a reminder of Mary's role in the Incarnation, which reopened the possibility of salvation through Christ. But for those with some grounding in the literature around the female vocation, the implications of her inclusion were perhaps more pointed and specific.

Like other Orders, the Dominicans drew on traditional patristic sources to express the ideal female vocation: nuns were to be the virgin brides of Christ, battling female frailty and waiting in their cloisters to be united with Him.⁵⁸ Thus their Master General Humbert of Romans (1194-1277) began a model sermon to women in cloister by reminding them, in a classic trope, that they were the chosen handmaidens and spouses of Christ; they were emulating the reclusive life of the Virgin and Esther, and reducing their chance of being raped like Dinah.⁵⁹ In the 1390s, when the Dominican Giovanni Dominici wrote to the Venetian nuns of Corpus Christi, he enjoined them to follow Christ's example and to be obedient to His will; they should be found within the cloister, waiting for him, as wives should not go out alone and Christ was

⁵⁸For an introduction to the dominant themes: de Fontette, Pásztor (1987), and Carla Casagrande, ed., *Prediche alle donne del secolo XIII* (Milan, 1978).

⁵⁹Casagrande, 37-42, Latin 57-60; for Humbert in general: Edward Tracy Brett, *Humbert of Romans: His Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society* (Toronto, 1984).

a jealous spouse.⁶⁰ He praised Mary, patroness of virgins and Bride of Christ, as their example; and he addressed the nuns as "reverende madonne," explaining "siete spose dello imperador del cielo e della terra e io sono sua creatura e disutile servo."⁶¹

Both of these writers were echoing the same authority, Saint Jerome (c. 340-420), and in fact the same text, his letter to the Virgin Eustochium.⁶² This was perhaps the most fundamental source for writings on female vocation, and it circulated widely in both Latin and vernacular versions throughout the Trecento and Quattrocento.⁶³ As Humbert and Giovanni would certainly have known, Jerome's letter also explained that Mary was the "Virgo mater multarum virginum," the model and the patroness of professed virgins, including the nuns of S. Aurea, brides of Christ in her footsteps; and the same letter contained the following passage in Mary's praise:

Postquam vero Virgo concepit in utero, et peperit nobis
puerum, "cujus principatus in humeros ejus," Deum, fortem,
patrem futuri saeculi, soluta maledictio est. Mors per Evam:
vita per Mariam. Ideoque et ditius virginitatis donum fluxit in
feminas, quia coepit a femina.⁶⁴

⁶⁰B. Giovanni Dominici OP, *Lettere spirituali*, eds. M-T Casella and G. Pozzi (Freiburg, 1969) Letter I, 60-61; Corpus Christi was part of Dominici's campaign for a renewed observance. For a panel from the convent: Gaudenz Freuler, "Andrea di Bartolo, Fra Tommaso d'Antonio Caffarini, and Sienese Dominicans in Venice" *AB* 69 (1987) 570-586.

⁶¹Dominici Letter VI, 83, and Letter VIII, 90-93.

⁶²Jerome, "Epistola XXII: Ad Eustochium, Paulae filiam. De Custodia virginitatis" *PL* 22, 394-425; for Humbertus, cf. Jerome 411; for Dominici, 395 and 422.

⁶³Parisse 16; Filippo Salmeri, ed., *Epistula di sanctu Iheronimu ad Eustochiu* (Catania, 1980).

⁶⁴Jerome, "Ad Eustochium" *PL* 22, 408; his idea that Mary was the special patron of female virgins is related to passages such as Origen's discussion of Mary and Elizabeth in "Homilia VIII" *Origenes Werk: Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und die Lukas-Kommentars*, ed. Max Rauer (Leipzig, 1930) 54-61, 54-55.

In relating Mary and Eve, Jerome was seeking to prove that virginity was a natural state, and that its loss was disastrous; the comparison was conventional, but pointed nonetheless. But the association seems to have gained a wider resonance among later writers, including those of the Order of Preachers, and if Mary was used as the example for nuns to emulate, Eve often served as a warning of the dangers they face, and their weakness in facing them. Thus in another model sermon for religious women, Humbert of Romans suggested the preacher should caution that many of them were under-zealous about maintaining their seclusion, and although not aware of their error, "*nec recordantur fragilitatis foemineae, et quomodo diabolus Evam seduxit: et ideo frequenter procurante hoste, istae ruunt in peccata.*"⁶⁵ And in late Trecento Venice, Giovanni Dominici's letters became more and more hostile as his Corpus Christi nuns strayed from his ideal. In an early rebuke, he says only that their struggles were not onerous: "*Niuna battaglia è più sicura e meno pericolosa che questa che avete, e, se questa mancasse, aresti delle più cocenti: converrebbevi combattere col serpente antico dal quale la prima madre nostra Eva si trovò sconfitta.*"⁶⁶ But his later letters are filled with references to the nuns' fragility, and at one point he states baldly that the sisters are Eves for tempting him to rejoice in worldly things.⁶⁷ The nadir, significantly, is his response to the convent's complaint about a new and stricter rule - essentially that of S. Sisto: having mentioned their fragility and compared them to spoiled babies, Dominici then rails: "*io credeva avere fabricato un corpo di Cristo già glorioso e impeccabile e io l'ho fatto pur di*

⁶⁵Casagrande 56-57; quotation 56.

⁶⁶Dominici Letter II, 65.

⁶⁷Dominici Letter XXXIII, 171.

mura e di carne fetida," before adding that even Adam and Eve in Paradise had rules to obey.⁶⁸ There is an echo here of several themes which have recurred throughout this thesis, and perhaps above all at S. Galgano, notably the linking of Eve, temptation, weakness, and feminine flesh; here, however, that flesh was present in the form of a convent of Trecento nuns.

While it is unlikely the Eve of the Aurea triptych was consciously intended as a warning, her inclusion as Mary's attribute in a convent image might have seemed particularly apposite to those familiar with these or similar writings, and perhaps even reflected some unconscious fears. This seems in fact to be the earliest image to include the snake as the instrument of Eve's temptation, a significant iconographic change which reappeared in the following decades at Magione and elsewhere; and it is the only image in which that snake serves as Eve's only attribute beyond her own fur-clad body (fig. 74). This tiny Eve seems in far greater need of the towering Mary's help, which she is actively seeking: the snake's menacing presence is underlined by its unusually large size and by Eve's right hand, in a gesture which seems to hover somewhere between a call for help and a plea for understanding. Presumably, the viewer was to be reassured: as Eve's advocate, and the nuns' advocate, and the Dominicans' advocate, Mary would always help.

But if the menaced Eve were too prominent, or if the snake seemed too overwhelming an adversary, it might risk an association of female weakness with the convent and the nuns themselves, including, perhaps, for the friars who oversaw the community; as we have seen, other male Dominicans were only too ready to invoke the first woman's fall when faced with real or imagined failings in her daughters, and at S. Aurea and elsewhere the potential

⁶⁸Dominici Letter XXX, 164-167.

dangers lurked on all sides. It seems every effort was made to limit or undermine this reading by the composition, and this may be a reason for Eve's reduced size in Vanni's panel, as well as her altered posture, both of which diminish her immediate visual impact; it may also be the reason why Mary, her Child, and the convent's two patrons, Aurea and Dominic, have become so large.

All of this, however, begs the question of commission and audience: it is clear the painting sat in the public church, but who was responsible for placing it there, and who was expected to see it? Given its iconography, and its apparent links to other Dominican altarpieces, it seems likely the image was shaped by a learned, and specifically Dominican, mind. The nuns themselves are perhaps the first candidates for the patronage, either one woman alone or acting as a group, yet they would be expected to work through an intermediary agent, who might have considerable impact on the commission, and here the evidence points in two directions.⁶⁹ On the one hand, laymen are documented as agents, and might be expected to leave the decisions about the altarpiece imagery to the nuns, but the first mention of an agent of any sort comes almost twenty years after Lippo Vanni's triptych was

⁶⁹The body of work on art in convent settings is slowly growing, but tends to underline the heterogeneity of the patronage, creation, and reception of art in female communities, rather than to suggest any typical pattern. See: Julian Gardner, "Nuns and Altarpieces: Agendas for Research" *Römisches Jahrbuch* 30 (1995) 27-57; Jeryldene M. Wood, "Breaking the Silence: The Poor Clares and the Visual Arts in Fifteenth-Century Italy" *Renaissance Quarterly* 48 (1995) 262-286; Cordelia Joan Warr, "Female Patronage and the Rise of Female Spirituality in Italian Art of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," Ph.D. diss., University of Warwick, 1994; Marilyn R. Dunn, "Nuns as Art Patrons: the Decoration of S. Marta al Collegio Romano" *AB* 70 (1988) 451-477; and a special issue of *Gesta* on Monastic Architecture for Women: *Gesta* 31/2 (1992). For Northern Europe: *Beauté et pauvreté: l'art chez les clarisses de France* (Paris, 1994); and P. Vandebroek, ed., *Le Jardin Clos de l'âme: l'Imaginaire des religieuses dans le Pays-Bas du sud, depuis le treizième siècle* (Brussels, 1994). This last work relies heavily on French feminist psychoanalytic theory; see Liz James, "Hysterical (Hi)stories of Art" *Oxford Art Journal* 18 (1995) 143-147, for the problems with such an approach.

signed.⁷⁰ On the other hand, there are the overseeing Roman friars, perhaps the more obvious suspects, who are recorded acting on behalf of S. Aurea in its Trecento documents and might therefore have influenced the creation, and possibly the iconography, of the 1358 painting.⁷¹ The Dominicans of the Roman Province were in fact notable patrons of Sienese artists, and Lippo Vanni himself is known to have done other work for them besides the important panel at S. Aurea: he painted an Annunciation in S. Domenico in Siena in 1372, and he may have worked in S. Domenico in Perugia as well.⁷² Furthermore, although Aurea is not a specifically Dominican saint, all known images of her are Trecento Dominican, and all but one were executed by pre-eminent Sienese painters, either for Ostia or Rome;⁷³ thus it seems possible Lippo Vanni's triptych was part of a larger pattern of commissions by the Order, promoting Aurea as a Dominican saint, and using the work of famous Sienese painters such as Duccio and Lippo Vanni to do so, and again, the friars may be obvious suspects, given that Aurea was the patron of Ostia, and Ostia was the see most often held by Duecento and Trecento Dominican cardinals.⁷⁴

⁷⁰Busta 75 (Pecchiali 151): in November 1399: "Paolo Andree Boni Anni notario de regione Pinee...vice et nomine domine Iacobe monialis venerabilis monasterii Castri Senensis de Urbe" acted to buy a house for the nuns.

⁷¹AGOP XII 9002 busta 73 (Pecchiali 150): in June 1385: "religioso et honesto viro fratri Blasio Micheli de Tybure priori fratrum, capitoli et conventus Sancti Blasii, ordinis predicatorum de Tybure...et procuratori, scyndico et yconomo monialium." For a slightly later example, see nt. 44 above.

⁷²Cannon (1980) 284-285 lists as Vanni's possible Dominican commissions a statute book of 1344, a fragmentary panel from Perugia and a panel now in the Kress Collection. The attribution of this last work has been disputed by Volpe (as in nt. 13).

⁷³Again, these are the Duccio panel (National Gallery), the Baltimore panel by Vanni or his circle; the Aurea panel, and the fresco in S. Domenico, Orvieto. See nts. 19 and 20.

⁷⁴Conradum Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica medii aevi*, 7 vols. (Monasteri, 1913, reprint Padua 1960) I, 35-36.

Yet there is at least one other distinct possibility for the 1358 patronage. Lippo Vanni was of course a Siennese artist, and the community surrounding S. Aurea was the Campo Senese: he could therefore have been chosen either because he was at hand, or because some member of this community knew of his work. The triptych itself may suggest the influence, if not the patronage, of the Siennese community, since altarpieces were not the norm for the high altars of Trecento Roman churches, as they were in Tuscan houses.⁷⁵ A Siennese involvement is difficult to prove, however, for no witness in the documents of S. Aurea is explicitly identified as Siennese, and the community may have used nearby S. Nicola de Incoronatis (or de Furca) rather than S. Aurea as its main church.⁷⁶ Furthermore, several important Roman shrines were in fact marked by paintings of some kind, providing a precedent.⁷⁷

Fortunately, there are three other recorded artistic bequests to S. Aurea in the Trecento, and they help to suggest a pattern; they are also the strongest evidence of interest and participation in the community, and therefore of the potential worshippers in the space of the public church where the triptych was located. These bequests date from 1348, 1368, and 1379, and to conclude, I would like to review them; and, as will become clear, they present a picture of the most influential Dominicans and S. Aurea's most prominent and powerful neighbours working hand in hand to decorate its church.

⁷⁵Julian Gardner, "Altars, Altarpieces and Art History: Legislation and Usage" Italian Altarpieces 1250-1550: Function and Design, eds. Eve Borsook and Fiorella Superbi Gioffredi (Oxford, 1994) 5-39, 13.

⁷⁶For S. Nicola and the Siennese: Ceccarius 18 (as in nt. 27), who however gives no source for this information.

⁷⁷A painting on the high altar of St. Peter's is recorded as early as the eighth century, while in the Sancta Sanctorum the famous icon of Christ had served as an altarpiece from at least 1073: Gardner (1974) 72.

IV. The Dominicans, the Orsini, and the Anguillara

The first of these bequests is in fact the earliest surviving record of the convent: on 12 June, 1348, Andrea di Orso Orsini left fifty gold florins to the "fabbrica" of S. Aurea "Campo Senese di Urbe."⁷⁸ The second has already been mentioned: it is that of the 1368 altar, discussed above, made by Donna Agnese Bovis, Count Francesco, and Countess Francesca Anguillara.

Although it is not immediately apparent, these two bequests may be linked. The Orsini were the most powerful family in Trecento Rome, and controlled the entire western sector of the city; the knight Andrea was the head of the Orsini of Campo dei Fiori, the piazza at one end of the "via magistralis" in which S. Aurea stood.⁷⁹ Andrea Orsini served as captain of various urban militias; he was Rector of the Patrimony of Saint Peter in 1333, and joint governor of Rome in 1336.⁸⁰ Similarly, the Anguillara were an old noble family of the Roman contado, whose holdings clustered around the Lago Bracciano, where the Castello of Anguillara still recalls their presence; the family had been divided into two branches by Cola di Rienzo, and in 1368 the

⁷⁸Gnoli (1939) 66-67, citing Archivio Orsini II, A.V. n.7.

⁷⁹For the Orsini: Sandro Carocci, Baroni di Roma: Dominazioni signorili e lignaggi aristocratici nel Duecento e nel primo Trecento (Rome, 1993) 387-403 and tables; Giuseppe Marchetti Longhi, I Bovesi e gli Orsini (Rome, 1960); Litta VII (Tavola XX for Andrea); Brentano, *passim*; Savio, "Niccolo III (Orsini) 1277-128" Civiltà Cattolica 20 ottobre 1894, 143ff, 2 febbraio 1895, 286-302, 2 marzo 1895, 546ff, 20 aprile 1895, 164-178; 18 maggio 1895, 425-434; for Orsini control of the city space: Enrico Guidoni, "Roma e l'urbanistica del Trecento" Storia dell'arte italiana, 305-383, 322-32. For the Anguillara: Carocci, 299-309; Vittorino Sora, "I Conti di Anguillara dalla loro origine al 1465" ASRSP 29 (1906) 397-442, and (1907) 53-118. Unfortunately, I have only seen the later issues of C. de Cupis, "Registro degli Orsini e dei Conti di Anguillara" Bollettino della regia società di storia patria Anton Ludovico Antinori 14 (1902) to 28/29 (1937-38).

⁸⁰Litta XX, Carocci, tav. I.

minor Francesco and his apparently younger brother Nicola were the Counts of Anguillara and Capranica, and had a palace and tower in Trastevere, not so far from S. Aurea, and the palace of Andrea's descendants.⁸¹ It might be objected the 1368 bequest came from Pucciarelli Pucci Bovis and his widow Agnese, and not the Anguillara, but as one of the Lords of Tolfavecchia, Pucciarelli was a vassal of the Counts of Anguillara, and Francesco's family figures prominently in the story of Pucciarelli's bequest.⁸² It therefore seems quite possible Pucciarelli's wish to endow S. Aurea was made at least with the Anguillaras' approbation, if not at their suggestion.

Both Andrea Orsini and Francesco Anguillara are in fact reminiscent of Francesco Casali or even Vanni "Forgia" Salimbeni: both were members of wealthy and powerful noble families, but not the most influential branches, and both were military figures. More importantly, however, the Orsini and the Anguillara were allies and even in-laws: the young Francesco Anguillara had Orsini women for a great-aunt, great-grandmother, and great-great-grandmother, and he may also have had an Orsini man as his great-uncle, since his aunt Emilia had received a dispensation to marry Matteo Orsini "del Monte," one of the Orsini of Monte Giordano.⁸³

⁸¹Carocci 302; for the remains of the tower and palace: Laura Gigli, ed, Guide Rionali di Roma, Rione XIII Trastevere, 3 vols. (Rome, 1982) III, 22-32. This area is marked by the present Lungotevere Anguillara.

⁸²Pucciarelli made a will on July 29, 1363, leaving Count Giovanni, Francesco's father, as his executor, and heir to almost all his goods, but Giovanni himself died before September of that year. Presumably the inheritance then passed to Giovanni's own heir, Francesco, while from the 1368 document Agnese seems to have become the executrix. Slightly later, the countess Francesca, Francesco's guardian, recorded she had four hundred florins in usufruct for Agnese, presumably the same four hundred florins marked for the S. Aurea bequest, and in July 1364 Francesco stipulated he would give Agnese fifty florins a year for two years, "propter multa servicia et merita per eum recepta a domina Angnete et propter magnum amorem quem ipse et pater eius habuit erga ispa." For this story: Sora (1907) 101-109; and (1906) 437 nt. 3 for Giovanni's death.

The two families may also be linked in some way to the last recorded artistic bequest, a tomb dated 1379, belonging to a Andrea di Todino del Monte, wife of Paolo degli Annibaldi.⁸⁴ A Romanella de Monte is mentioned among the nuns of 1413, and it is possible the two women were members of the same family; it is also just possible both "de Monte" women might have been Orsini "del Monte," relatives of the Campo dei Fiori Orsini and the Trastevere Anguillara.⁸⁵

Even more importantly, S. Aurea's first benefactor, Andrea Orsini, also had very strong ties to Dominicans of the very highest level: his brother Matteo had been a Dominican cardinal, who taught at Paris and Bologna, served as head of the Province of Rome, and died in 1341 as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina and de facto protector of the Order.⁸⁶ In his will, Matteo left money to Andrea, and founded a family chapel in the main Dominican church of Rome, Santa Maria sopra Minerva; in Andrea's own will, made eight years later, he chose to be buried in this chapel and left ten gold florins for the

⁸³The women were Orsina di Francesco Orsini del Monte, Costanza di Orso, and Angela di Gentile. For the Monte Giordano Orsini: Brentano 185-186 and Carocci 399-400 and tavola 11. This branch was linked to the Anguillara by more than marriage: they also had shared property, with each holding half of Magliano near Lake Bracciano after 1314: Carocci 400.

⁸⁴Zucchi 149, who mentions this tomb slab incorporated into the fabric of the later Spirito Santo dei Napoletani. The existence of this tomb is not certain, however, as it is not listed in other sources on Spirito Santo, nor by Vincenzo Forcella, Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edifici di Roma dal secolo XI fino ai giorni nostri (Rome, 1876) VII, 327-338. The description of the church in Rione VII Regola, (as in nt. 27) III, 26 says only there are "molte lapidi provenienti dalla chiesa precedente" in the flooring.

⁸⁵Gnoli (1939) 177 notes Monte Giordano was commonly called simply "Il Monte," but I am not certain whether the Orsini themselves were also so called. It is also quite possible that "Monte" may simply be an indication of the nun's former rione of residence, although this seems less likely for the tomb.

⁸⁶For Matteo, see Forte, Litta, XX, and Carocci, tav. I. Matteo was named Provincial of the Province of Rome in 1322, and was later created bishop of Agrigento, Archbishop of Siponto, and in 1327, Cardinal of S. Giovanni e Paolo. In the 1330s he was given the archbishopric of Palermo, which he ceded when named Cardinal Bishop of Sabina in 1336. It is Forte who describes Matteo as de facto protector, although this post did not officially exist until c. 1376; see the same author's The Cardinal-Protector of the Dominican Order (Rome, 1959).

purpose, but this was a relatively small sum against the fifty given to the hitherto-undocumented Sant'Aurea.⁸⁷ Thus Andrea was a rich and influential neighbour of the convent, and with direct ties to the Dominicans, as well as reasons to be devoted to and grateful to them; as early as 1339 the Chapter of the Roman Province were remembering him in their prayers.⁸⁸

It seems clear, then, that the family, friends, and clients of Andrea Orsini and the Orsini of Campo dei Fiori were important in the early years of S. Aurea. In one sense this is unsurprising: convents were very much neighbourhood institutions, and the support of the most important local families might therefore be expected, and even necessary. But given that the earliest record of the place is the bequest of Andrea Orsini, a man whose brother was a Dominican cardinal, this involvement may have gone somewhat deeper, as it is known to have done at other Roman convents in this period. In the 1280s, for example, the venerable church of S. Silvestro in Capite was taken from its Benedictine monks to become a Franciscan convent through the efforts of the Colonna, the only family in Rome to rival the Orsini in power; at the suggestion of two Colonna cardinals, S. Silvestro was given to a group of women who had lived around the saintly Margaret Colonna, who then lived under rules drawn up by Cardinal Giacomo Colonna; the Colonna and their clients filled S. Silvestro with their daughters, both legitimate and otherwise, and they also left monies and lands to support the foundation.⁸⁹

⁸⁷For the chapel, now of the Holy Sacrament but originally dedicated to Catherine of Alexandria: Giancarlo Palmerio and Gabriella Villetti, *Storia edilizia di S. Maria sopra Minerva in Roma 1275-1870* (Roma, 1989) 48-53, 152-156; and 53 for Andrea's bequest. When Matteo made his 1340 will, Andrea was his only surviving brother, and he and his nephews were heirs to all Matteo's lands; Andrea and one nephew also received a total of 1400 florins to settle their debts: Forte 246, 250, 257.

⁸⁸Forte 244, nt. 18; Andrea is listed in the Chapter's suffrages "pro vivis."

⁸⁹For the Colonna, the Franciscans, and S. Silvestro: Brentano 230-247, especially 241-247.

At S. Silvestro, the interests of the local family and the Franciscan order came together, and it therefore seems possible that something similar might have happened at Sant'Aurea: perhaps, when the Dominicans founded it, or took over and reformed an existing foundation, they turned for help to Andrea Orsini, head of the Orsini faction of the area and last surviving brother of their late Cardinal-Protector, Matteo. Perhaps they even depended on the promised bequests of Andrea and his clients for the decoration of the convent itself, dedicated to the patron saint of Ostia, the "Roman" see most often held by Dominicans in the fourteenth century.

Of course, none of this is certain, but Andrea Orsini and Francesco Anguillara do correspond to the type of aristocratic patron and worshipper for paintings of the Madonna and Child with Eve found embodied in Francesco Casali's image at Magione. And if the Dominicans and these local magnates worked together for the creation of Lippo Vanni's triptych, the noted Dominican influence would be explained, as well as the image's links to both other images from the Order, and a whole tradition relating Mary and Eve in writing on female vocations.

IV. Conclusions, and a Final Word about Female Viewers

After the last nuns left S. Aurea, they seem to have been quickly absorbed into the S. Sisto community; almost no later sisters took the name Aurea, and none of them is recorded to have had any special devotion to her.⁹⁰ The triptych itself was brought to S. Sisto and then to Ss. Domenico e Sisto after that, though here it was placed on an altar near the confessional of the

⁹⁰For instance, there are only two Aureas recorded in the entire seventeenth century: Berthier II, 250.

nuns' choir, rather than in the new church being built. At any time, one nun was given the responsibility for it, at least one of whom was sufficiently devoted to have it restored and to obtain a relic of Aurea and an indulgence for her feast.⁹¹ But never again did Vanni's painting have its former prominence: the nuns of S. Sisto had their own artworks, including a Madonna attributed to St. Luke himself, and Vanni's triptych could hardly be expected to compete.⁹²

Nevertheless, the work was still important enough for the last Aurea nuns to take it with them, which suggests it was an important symbol of the community, at least by the sixteenth century, and before leaving Trecento S. Aurea, it seems appropriate to devote at least a few words to the nuns' own possible understanding of Lippo Vanni's work, which represented their community to the world. They are after all the only women who can be securely linked to an image of the Madonna and Child with Eve at their feet, and it remains quite possible that they were involved in the creation and commission of the triptych: if local magnates were involved in its production, there is no reason they could not have acted in conjunction with the nuns as well as, or instead of, the friars.

Several modern writers have argued either images or devotion were different in male and female communities: Caroline Walker Bynum, for instance, has argued the written vestiges of Trecento and Quattrocento female piety show a heightened insistence on the realities of the incarnation and the body of Christ, rather than on secondary or female figures.⁹³ Caroline

⁹¹Berthier II, 121-123: the nun was Mother Girolama Conti, who entered S. Sisto in 158; Berthier says the relic was a part of Aurea's finger, subsequently lost.

⁹²For the Madonna: Koudelka (as in nt. 39); Pietro Amato, De Vera Effigie Mariae: Antiche Icone Romani (Rome, 1988); and Francesco Maria Torriggio, Historia della Veneranda Immagine di Maria Vergine posta nella Chiesa del Monastero delle RR. Monache di Santi Sisto e Domenico di Roma (Rome, 1641).

Bruzelius and Jeffrey Hamburger have made a different but related suggestion, arguing images played a distinct and more important role in female religious communities than in male ones, acting as aids to sustained meditation in the absence of visual access to the Mass.⁹⁴

Given the dominant themes in the preaching and literature addressed to them, it might be expected the nuns of S. Aurea would wish to have Mary and Aurea as their advocates and examples, and that they would have known Eve had been saved by Mary's love and intervention. On the other hand, Eve's presence might have been slightly less welcome if she were often held up as a warning; it is not clear, for instance, that the Corpus Christi correspondents of Giovanni Dominici would have welcomed the image with open arms.

In the end, we can only guess, as evidence elsewhere is contradictory. Yet there were two women in late fourteenth-century Rome who did leave some record of their beliefs, atypical as they might have been: both Bridget of Sweden, who died there in 1373, and Catherine of Siena, who was resident in 1380, briefly lived close to S. Aurea in the area near the Campo dei Fiori.⁹⁵ The works of these two writers, however, only stress how little can be assumed about women's relations to common themes. Eve appears in only two

⁹³Caroline Walker Bynum, Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1987); and Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion (New York, 1991).

⁹⁴Bruzelius 87; Jeffrey Hamburger, "Art, Enclosure, and the *Cura Monialum*: Prolegomena in the Guise of a Postscript," both Gesta 31/2 (1992) 108-134; and "The use of images in the pastoral care of nuns: the case of Heinrich Suso and the Dominicans" AB 71 (1989) 20-46, which makes the same point as greater length. However, Rusconi 316 cautions that such suggestions may be based at least in part on an underestimation of the nuns' literacy, which leads the importance of non-written sources to be overstressed; it may also rest partly on the old argument that images are suited to the weaker minds of women and children.

⁹⁵For an introduction to these saints: Arnold Esch, "Tre sante ed il loro ambiente sociale a Roma: S. Francesca Romana, S. Brigida di Svezia, e S. Caterina da Siena" Atti del simposio internazionale cateriniano-bernardiniano (Siena, 17-20 aprile, 1980), eds. Domenico Maffei and Paolo Nardi (Siena, 1982) 89-120.

places in Bridget's Revelations, in which the fine points of Christian doctrine are revealed to her in a series of visions, and both the contents and the contexts of these references are entirely traditional. First the Virgin explains to Bridget that as Adam and Eve sold the world for a fruit, she and her Son took it back with a heart. Later both Adam and Eve are mentioned again when it is explained why Christ wished to be born of a virgin; both of them were of course virgins in Paradise.⁹⁶ Equally traditionally, in the Officium Paruum composed for her nuns, Brigdet included such hymns as the Ave Maris Stella, where Mary is described as "mutans Evae nomen."⁹⁷

In Catherine's voluminous writings, on the other hand, Eve is hardly mentioned, and more significantly, she never comes up when Catherine is writing to nuns: unlike Giovanni Dominici, Catherine makes no references to Eve in her warnings and exhortations.⁹⁸ Perhaps Catherine, herself subject to a number of male confessors and spiritual advisors, felt there was little to be gained and much to be lost in dwelling, once again, on that first instance of female weakness, and perhaps the nuns of S. Aurea would have agreed with her.

⁹⁶Bridget of Sweden, Revelaciones, ed. Carl-Gustaf Undhagen (Stockholm, 1977) Liber I, 35 and Liber V, 12.

⁹⁷Tryggve Lundén, ed., Den heliga Birgitta och den helige Petrus av Skåanninge, Officium parvum beate Marie Virginis, 2 vols. (Lund, 1976) I, 44: "Pro Santimoniali defuncta."

⁹⁸There are only two references to Eve, and only one by name, in Catherine's Libro della divina dottrina: she mentions Christ is truth and continues: Né può cadere in tenebre, perché Egli è luce, privato della bugia: anco con lar veritá confuse e destrusse la bugia del dimonio, la quale elli dixe ad Eva. La quale bugia ruppe la strada del cielo; e la Veritá l'ha racconcia e murata col Sangue." Much later it is explained Adam "cadde nella disobbedienza, e dalla disobbedienza a la immondizia, con superbia e piacere femminile, volendo più tosto conscondere e piacere a la compagna sua (poniamo che non credesse però a lei quello che ella diceva), consentì più tosto di trapassare l'obbedienza mia che contristarla." Caterina da Siena, Libro della Divina dottrina, volgarmente detto Dialogo della divina provvidenza ed. Matilde Fiorilli (Bari, 1912), 53, 304. See Noffke for Catherine's letters.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has now examined all extant frescoes of the Virgin Mary with Eve at her feet, from the earliest work at Montesiepi (fig. 12) to the final example at S. Severino Marche (fig. 67), as well as two of the twelve surviving panels. Thus it is time to determine what has been learned from the close analysis of the context and creation of these distinctive paintings; to do so, I would like to review briefly the findings of each chapter, before passing to the more general conclusions which may be drawn from the survey as a whole.

As we have seen, the theme of Mary as the New Eve is one of the fundamental and most important themes of mariology, arising within less than a hundred and fifty years of Christ's own death; and it lay at the very heart of her cult. The pairing was modeled on the Biblical precedent of Christ as the New Adam formulated by Paul, which relied on the rhetorical principle of recirculation or recapitulation; the link between Mary and Eve seemed further justified by the so-called Proto-evangelium, Genesis 3, 15, where God told the serpent a female figure, "Ipsa," would crush its head. As this female figure was identified with Mary, the Bible itself seemed to suggest that both the Fall and the Incarnation, and therefore the Virgin and Eve, were linked in a predestined cycle of damnation and redemption. This passage was taken as a fundamental indication of the Virgin's role as Mediatrix for humanity: if Mary's actions had allowed her to act as Eve's advocate, redeeming even this most serious sin, the Virgin could be seen as the intercessor for Eve's descendants, all those who shared her flesh, and particularly for those, like Eve and Mary, who were women or virgins. Moreover, partly because flesh

was broadly understood as feminine, in more learned circles, Eve was sometimes allegorised as human nature, or specifically the fleshly body, while vernacular sources often stressed Mary's own flesh as a reason for her responsibility for sinners in general: as the supplicants' "parentadhego," she was expected to intervene on their behalf, as she had done for the First Mother, Eve; thus, by extension, Mary interceding for Eve might be Mary interceding for all Eve's fallen descendants. These themes were widely diffused in Trecento and Quattrocento society by the hymns and liturgies of Mary's feasts, by Latin and vernacular sermons, and by devotional literature, laude, poetry, and prose.

The first surviving use of an image of Mary with Eve at her feet, at the former Cistercian abbey of S. Galgano (fig. 12), suggests it developed in a climate of particularly heightened Marian devotion. At S. Galgano, the Virgin was the head of the Order, a role which justified a very unusual image of her as an enthroned Queen without the Child, surrounded by Cistercian saints and personifications of the Order's Rule. Eve's inclusion must therefore have been intended as a further honour to Mary, and as a clear expression of the Virgin's power, perhaps especially because her usual "attribute," Christ, was not included. Eve's presence was also a reminder of how Mary had achieved her predestined and exalted state, especially with the Annunciation pictured just below. But the figure also seems to have personified something of the monks' own need for Mary's intercession, as it often did in Cistercian writings and hymns: as Eve's flesh was their flesh, they might share her weakness, but they could also hope for Mary's forgiveness, and to join their illustrious founders, Bernard, Benedict, and Galgano, in Mary's heavenly court. Eve may even have been semi-allegorical in conception, linked to the female personifications of the Cistercian Rule who flanked her, and created by

a painter who specialised in allegorical figurations. In any case, it seems clear this image and cycle were intended for a restricted audience of male and relatively learned viewers: the chapel's patron may himself have been a member of the S. Galgano community, and the subsequent changes to the Montesiepi Maestà and Annunciation suggest the monks discovered their particular view was not deemed fully appropriate by a wider audience.

The next painting, the Coronation of 1340s Montefalco (fig. 37), also appeared in a context where a learned, and specifically clerical, audience was potentially an important factor, in this case the various officials of the government of the Papal Duchy of Spoleto, who had taken refuge in the town as they sought to reassert their spiritual and temporal authority. Here Mary may have had a dual role, as Queen of Heaven and exemplar of the earthly Church. As an image of Mary's Coronation in Paradise after her Assumption, the fresco stressed the unique honour due to her, as well as her power in Heaven to intercede; with Eve's inclusion, it might have conveyed more strongly the donors' hope that, honoured in this exemplary manner, the Virgin would help them to follow her to Heaven, in a final victory over death, the legacy of Original Sin. This is probably one reason why, perhaps fifty years later, a similar composition was used by the Orvietan Piero di Puccio in the chapel of the Pisa Camposanto (fig. 47): this second painting is the clearest indication of the link between Mary's role as the advocate of Eve and her descendants, and the pious hope for a final victory over death. This hope, however, could also have been a factor in other examples, including at S. Galgano, for instance, in what was probably a funeral chapel; it might also explain the iconography's adoption for numerous smaller panels (figs. 85-92),

mostly less than half a meter in height, and presumably used for oratory chapels and altars.¹

But because the general is present in the particular, "quae de Ecclesia generaliter...dicuntur, ad Mariam specialiter referri possunt."² Hence any and every painting of Mary crowned or enthroned might also be an image of the Church's triumph: this was probably important for the Montefalco composition, for example, given the struggles of the Papal government that framed its creation. It may also have shaped the understanding of the Cleveland panel (fig. 1): through its imagery of Mary as both Eve's advocate and the Woman of the Apocalypse, this painting brought together the on-going battle against evil with the association of death and resurrection of the Last Judgment, where Mary's intercessory role would be crucial, thereby linking Mary and Eve as participants in both struggles.

At Magione (fig. 49), the Church's own continuing battle against evil was quite possibly the reason for the image's creation: its patron, the knight Francesco Casali, Lord of Cortona, may have commissioned the painting in 1371, at the end of the Papal crusade against Perugia. This painting should probably be understood as an image of Casali's own ideal persona: as one of the many small signori of Trecento Central Italy, he undoubtedly had pretensions to the military role that defined the older nobility, including the chivalrous piety they were encouraged to cultivate; and in commemorating his defense of the Virgin and her Church, he was representing both his status and his devotion in socially sanctioned terms. Thus the image produced casts Mary as the Lady whom Francesco had chosen to serve, making use of the visual

¹See the Appendix: the largest work is the Altenburg panel attributed to the Lucchese Angelo Puccinelli, 98 x 53 cm with attached frame.

²"Walafrid Strabo, monk of Fulda" "Glossa ordinaria" PL 113, 911.

codes of contemporary chivalry to stress Francesco's own fealty; it also used every possible attribute to enhance its praise and honour of Mary, including queenly regalia to stress her rule, angels singing the Gaude Virgo in a perpetual office of praise, and of course Eve herself, the first among Mary's redeemed. In the context of the crusade, however, Eve's inclusion also had two potential associations: as Mary had undone and redeemed Eve's sin, Francesco's own military service had earned a full pardon of his own wrongs through papal indulgences; yet Francesco also survived an attempt on his life in that same year, and the need for Mary's mercy and advocacy at final judgment might not have been so far from his mind.

The last image, Lippo Vanni's triptych for the convent of S. Aurea (fig. 68), is the only one that can be linked to a female community, and therefore the only one which should undoubtedly be related to the long tradition identifying the Second Eve as the advocate of women in general and particularly of female virgins and nuns, sanctioned by a millennial tradition of writings on the female vocation. Thus the theme of Mary as Eve's protector and advocate was appropriate for a convent setting. But the iconography may also have been a two-edged sword: the notable hierarchy of size and scale in the image suggests every effort was made to limit the possible negative associations of Eve menaced by the serpent at Mary's feet, especially, perhaps, since the Dominicans themselves seem to have been accustomed to casting feminine weakness in Eve's likeness.

Several more general points should now be made. The first is already suggested in the descriptions given above, but it deserves to be stressed. Although it may seem surprising that what strikes the modern viewer as such an unusual composition should not "mean" something clear and specific, the inclusion of Eve at Mary's feet had no fixed, singular and predominant

significance. Instead, it drew on a knot of related ideas: Eve's use as Mary's attribute might be described not so much a means of limiting signification as of rendering it more intensely, but within a proscribed range of possible choices - Mary is Eve's advocate and humanity's advocate, Mary delivers sinners from death, and will always help those who call on her, in the face of specific temptations or at their final hour. Arguably, the imagery was successful because it provided a clear expression of these basic Christian hopes, and here some of the more ambivalent aspects of Eve's Trecento and Quattrocento personality were strengths, not weaknesses: her association with human flesh and human frailty, as well as her direct genealogical link to Mary, Christ, and all humanity made her an ideal stand-in for her own son or daughter, the Christian supplicant at Mary's throne, encouraged by countless hymns and laude to invoke Mother Mary's help. As such, Eve's inclusion was far more than the invocation of one of Mary's few biblical types.³ It was a succinct method of invoking Mary's intercessory role, the role that lay at the very heart of the Virgin's medieval cult.⁴

The pairing of Mary and Eve was thus appropriate for many different settings, because it was relevant in any instance where there was a wish to express the greatest possible praise of Mary, and to ask for her special concern, using Eve as an attribute, an example and perhaps even a prod.

³For obvious reasons, Mary can be related to biblical queens such as Esther, for instance, but it is not especially common for late-medieval or early Renaissance writers to do so; and there are many more Christological types, just as there are more prominent male figures in the Bible: Christ is not only the Second Adam, he is also Solomon or David, for instance, while Jonah in the whale is a type of the Death, Entombment, and Resurrection, as Giotto presented it in at Padua, for instance: Giuseppe Basile, ed., Giotto: La Cappella degli Scrovegni (Milan, 1992) 361. For Mariological types, see Schiller, and for Christological types, see the same author's Ikongraphie der christlichen Kunst: Christus, 3 vols. (Gutersloh, 1980) II, 142-145; III, 125-140.

⁴For the primacy of intercession: Coathalem 59, 87-120; Jugie 195-212; Graef 170-171.

Hence perhaps the relatively high number of images of the Virgin in which she is also crowned or being crowned, the greatest expression of her honour. Therefore paintings of Mary with Eve at her feet could and did occur in a Cistercian abbey, a Dominican convent, a cathedral burial ground, as well as in the churches of Augustinians, Franciscans, and Regular Canons, and on many private panels; therefore it is unsurprising that the saints included in the paintings should be similarly heterogeneous.

Before discussing possible reasons for the decline of the imagery, a number of general comments should be made about its spread, which may also provide some indication of the possible influence of Sienese models in Trecento painting. The mechanism of this diffusion is not completely clear, although from the case of Siena it seems certain that once in the repertoire of a group of artists in a city, it could be reused for many years. There are three main possibilities of transmission, by no means mutually exclusive. The first is by the painters themselves: thus from Lorenzetti and S. Galgano, it spread first to other Sienese artists, including Lippo Vanni and later Paolo di Giovanni Fei (figs. 84-86). Angelo Puccinelli of Lucca may have learned it from them (fig. 88), as he is documented in Siena in 1379; Giuliano di Simone might have learned from him (figs. 89-91), and the Marchigiani and the Florentines (figs. 1, 67, 92-94), who were late converts to the imagery, from someone who had been to Siena (or Lucca, or perhaps even Orvieto).⁵ It is known, for instance, that the Florentine Lorenzo Ghiberti was a great admirer of Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Sienese Trecento painting; this admiration was given a concrete form when in the 1430s he cast an Eve for the Gates of Paradise of the Florentine Baptistery, closely modeled on those figures

⁵See the Appendix for these artists and panels.

reclining at Mary's feet in Sienese paintings, and this figure was itself imitated a few years later by at least one Florentine painter (fig. 93).⁶

The second method for the spread of the imagery is through the patrons. This is harder to trace; it would depend on a combination of influence, movement and intermarriage. Thus we know, for instance, that Francesco Casali, patron of the Magione fresco (fig. 49), was a knight of the city of Siena, and owned a palace in the city and property in its contado; his wife Chiodolina was the daughter of the Lords of Camerino, home town of the painter Carlo (fig. 1), and later of S. Severino Marche, where the fragment of Eve was created in S. Francesco (fig. 67); their son Francesco Senese lived with one branch of the Sienese Salimbeni family in the 1380s, and married a daughter of the house, Antonia di Agnolino Salimbeni.⁷ In this light, it is intriguing that the work closest to the Magione fresco is the Paolo di Giovanni Fei in New York (fig. 84), of the 1380s: the cloth behind the Virgin and Child and the portrayal of Eve are very similar. The same type of links could be made through the Roman Orsini in and around S. Aurea, surrounded by their Sienese neighbours. And many of the paintings seem to show little direct knowledge of earlier works, perhaps the result of each painter adapting a composition to his own strengths and interests, but also possibly the result of an image being described to a painter, which he then tried to recreate.

Presumably, however, such spread might be partly artist-driven, and partly patron-driven: thus the Orvietan artist employed at Magione might then have passed the imagery to other artists in and around that city, including Piero di Puccio (fig. 47); on the other hand, the use of the iconography at S.

⁶Richard Krautheimer with Trude Krautheimer-Hess, Lorenzo Ghiberti (Princeton, NJ, 1956) 159-168, and 214-225; see the Appendix, n. 10, for the panel painting.

⁷The Casali and their links to Siena were discussed in Chapter Four.

Aurea (fig. 68) could be related to knowledge of Sienese examples, either by the painter Lippo Vanni, the Dominicans, or their neighbours. Still, a third and final possibility is transmission by unrelated people: it is known, for instance, that several of the famous mercenary companies were in both S. Galgano and Magione, as well as in and around Tuscany and the Papal States, and presumably they observed, and occasionally looted, what they saw.

In any case, it seems clear the imagery only ever appealed to a select group in the first place, for although there are almost twenty extant examples, this is a tiny fraction of the surviving Madonna panels. It seems clear that in each city there was a small circle of associated painters who used the iconography; in most cases they were also the most favoured painters in the area -Angelo Puccinelli and Giuliano di Simone, Carlo da Camerino (figs. 1, 88-91)- and the early works are all notable commissions, of striking quality of materials and execution, and created by the most eminent, if local, painters, suggesting discerning and generous patrons.⁸ By the last examples, however, the iconography's use seems to have been limited to minor commissions: the panel by the Florentine Master of the Straus Madonna is noticeably less impressive than earlier works (fig. 92), and the series terminates with a fairly humble domestic tabernacle by Paolo Schiavo (fig. 93), probably more than a hundred years after the composition had first appeared.⁹

In fact, the iconography never seems to have been attractive to a wide public in the first place: what little can be determined about the patronage of the images suggests a fairly narrow range of elite donors, although such conclusions are necessarily tentative. Two groups predominate. The first, not

⁸See for example the works by Paolo di Giovanni Fei, Angelo Puccinelli, and Giuliano di Simone, Appendix, 1, 5, 6.

⁹Appendix 9, 10.

surprisingly, is the clergy itself, the Latin-reading classes who would have heard Mary and Eve related for every one of Mary's feasts, in countless hymns and lauds, and within the Virgin's Office: such patrons include the late-Trecento prior of S. Gregorio Maggiore in Spoleto (fig. 48), for instance, and perhaps the monks of S. Galgano.

The second group might be characterised as a middling aristocracy, those with some claim to nobility, but often with limited actual power or security: the most obvious example here is Francesco Casali, Signore Generale of Cortona but vassal of Siena. Yet others of his caste lurk in the shadows of these paintings: thus the Anguillara and the Orsini, although not the most powerful members of the clan, surround the convent of S. Aurea and Lippo Vanni's triptych (fig. 68); the large Mary/Eve fresco in S. Francesco in S. Severino (fig. 67) lay across from the tower of the Smeducci signori of the town, who had seen to the church's construction and renovation. Even at S. Galgano (fig. 12), such a patron may have played a part: the Rotunda chapel may in fact have been created by Vanni Salimbeni, himself a member of the most powerful family in Siena, but, as with Andrea Orsini, not its most powerful or influential branch. At Cleveland a crest appears (fig. 1), and almost all of the panels, as mentioned, were important, but presumably local, commissions. In fact, the placement of the paintings often mirrors the condition of these patrons: the images occur in the important churches of less important towns, as at S. Severino Marche, for instance; less commonly, they occur in the less important churches of larger centres, as in S. Aurea in Rome. This generally marginal presence must also have helped to limit the iconography's spread.

It is not possible to say the imagery appealed above all to such patrons, but their presence cannot be ignored; and while there is no evidence that the

imagery constituted a kind of shared sign of belonging, or perhaps a wish to stress a link to Siena, it is true that such people were linked amongst themselves by property and alliance, and might even have aided its spread. In any case, the two groups of patrons, the learned and clerical and the small signori, no doubt overlapped, and as at S. Aurea, they may have worked in tandem. In this regard, it may be significant that related compositions, the paintings of saintly doctors presiding over fallen intellectual rivals (figs. 10, 11) were normally found in those spaces of the churches with the most restricted access, such as the choir or chapel of the high altar, suggesting they too were especially intended for the clergy and those who aspired to be their most honoured secular patrons.¹⁰

Yet although, as argued, the iconography seems to have successfully expressed the wish and expectation of Mary's mediation, and although some allowance must be made for the accidents of survival, it does seem clear the specific form of the composition was only attractive for about a hundred years, and that it never gained much ground outside central Italy. Moreover, the late examples are the least inspired, and it seems the imagery had not been used for a major public commission since the Pisan fresco of 1390; in Siena itself its use cannot be traced past the 1370s and 1380s with Paolo di Giovanni Fei and Niccolò di Buonaccorso (figs. 84-87), except for Giovanni di Paolo's single Commedia miniature of the 1440s (fig. 83) - and he of course was an artist with an interest in the Trecento visual traditions of his home town. This is the final problem raised by these works: why did the iconography of Mary with

¹⁰ Although the original location of the Pisa St. Thomas panel is uncertain, the Montalcino Augustine is located in the high altar chapel; other Trecento examples also lay in the most private spaces of the church or in the monastic buildings: Dorothee Hansen, Das Bild des Ordenslehrers und die Allegorie des Wissens: Ein gemaltes Program der Augustiner (Berlin, 1995), passim.

Eve at her feet disappear so quickly? Any answers are speculative, but it might be suggested that several converging factors helped its fairly rapid demise.

I began this thesis by contrasting the Cleveland panel of the 1390s (fig. 1) with a series of altarpieces created perhaps thirty years later, by the Dominican Fra Angelico, in which, as in his altarpiece for S. Domenico in Cortona, for example, the main scene of the Annunciation includes a small Expulsion in one corner (fig. 6). Certainly the difference between the two renderings might be partly a matter of each painter's temperament, and partly a matter of stylistic development: between them lies the development of a theory of the image as something like a window giving onto a unified space, codified most famously in Alberti's 1436 *Della Pittura*.¹¹ So there is no doubt that changes in fashion and visual theory played a part in the broadening and then lessening of the imagery's appeal, especially since the use of allegorical figures and personifications in painting was undoubtedly in decline; this use was a notable feature of Trecento art in general, and, as suggested, a possible spur to Eve's early inclusion at Montesiepi, but habits of interpretation were no doubt changing.¹² More generally, perhaps, as the novelty of the composition diminished, it quickly lost the intensifying aspect that lay behind its adoption.

¹¹Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting*, trans. John R. Spencer, 2nd ed. (New Haven and London, 1966). For a discussion of the background of this stylistic debate: Michael Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of painting in Italy and the discovery of pictorial composition 1350-1450* (Oxford, 1971).

¹²Hans Belting, "The New Role of Narrative in Public Painting of the Trecento: *Historia* and Allegory" *Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 16. (Washington DC, 1985) 151-168; and for the rise and fall of allegory in general: Carolyn Van Dyke, *The Fiction of Truth: Structures of Meaning in Narrative and Dramatic Allegory* (Ithaca and London, 1985); Rosamund Tuve, *Allegorical Imagery: Some Medieval Books and Their Posterity* (Princeton, NJ, 1966); Angus Fletcher, *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode* (Ithaca, 1964).

Yet, as we have seen, these painting of Mary with Eve at her feet relied on the presumption of a delicate balance: it had to be clear Eve's presence caused Mary honour, not offense, and a range of painterly solutions was adopted to ensure this, including for instance depicting Eve with a halo to stress her blessed role and her place as an ancestor of Mary and Christ (figs. 49, 84-88, 90, 92). It might be suggested, in fact, that the undermining of this balance was one cause of the composition's disappearance, and that the form of that breakdown may reveal a final, fundamental aspect of the iconography.

From the beginning of the Quattrocento, it became increasingly common to include large painted chests, called cassoni, among the items created for a marriage; these were often displayed in the wedding procession, and then placed around the bed in the couple's new quarters.¹³ These cassoni often had scenes on their fronts and sides, usually drawn from history or literature. But sometimes the underside of the lid was also painted, and here the image was almost always a reclining human figure, usually a young woman, and sometimes with a young man included in the other chest of the pair; the young women, in fact, were normally blonde, pretty, and scantily clad, disposed on their sides to fit the long, narrow space (fig. 82). As such, their depiction was not unlike that of Eve herself in many of the mid- and later-Trecento images. There has been some discussion about how much these cassoni figures should be seen as amorous or overtly erotic in meaning, but it

¹³Rose Marie San Juan, "Mythology, Women, and Renaissance Private Life: the Myth of Eurydice in Italian Furniture Painting" AH 15 (1992) 127-145; Cristelle L. Baskins, "'La festa di Susanna': Virtue on Trial in Renaissance Sacred Drama and Painted Wedding Chests" AH 14 (1991) 329-344; Brucia Witthoft, "Marriage Rituals and Marriage Chests in Quattrocento Florence" Artibus et historiae 5 (1982) 43-59; Beyond Nobility: Art for the Private Citizen in the Early Renaissance (Allentown, PA, 1980); Ellen Callmann, "The Growing Threat to Marital Bliss in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Paintings" Studies in Iconography 5 (1979) 73-93; and Apollonio di Giovanni (Oxford, 1974); Paul Schubring, Cassoni, Truhen und Truhenbilder der italienischen Frührenaissance, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1923). For the background of this new form of art and consumption, see Goldthwaite, especially 149-255.

seems clear that a similar schema was now being used in semi-private, and certainly secular settings.

Without wishing to argue that the one displaced the other, it might be said that the later figures place an accent on something that was already potentially present in the former, and in this light, it is perhaps worth mentioning Giovanni Boccaccio's "Conclusion" to the Decameron. Defending himself against the charge that his work was scandalous, especially in certain expressions which he had placed in the mouths of ladies, he opined it was no more improper for him to use such language than for real men and women to use such words as "foro e caviglia e mortaio e pestello e salsiccia e mortadella." Furthermore, he adds, his pen should be granted the same freedom as the painter's brush, which "senza alcuna riprensione, o almen giusta" is allowed to depict "Christo maschio, e Eva femina."¹⁴ The rhetorical linking from what he clearly knows is a sexualised vocabulary to the bare flesh, rightly or wrongly censured, of Christ and Eve (not Mary), cannot be completely dismissed as a trick of argument, and it is perhaps worth mentioning once again that a number of the paintings, including the panel at Cleveland, would subsequently be vandalised by unhappy viewers.

The potential weakness in any image of Mary with Eve at her feet was that Eve's presence might become too overpowering, or bring too many negative associations, especially since her presence was a strong reminder of a shared, but also frail and sinning, human flesh. Some hint of this problem, in fact, might be summed up by a comparison of the S. Aurea triptych with the Maestà lunette of Montesiepi, especially since Lippo Vanni seems to have been influenced by Ambrogio Lorenzetti in other aspects of his work, and

¹⁴Giovanni Boccaccio, Decameron: edizione critica secondo l'autografo Hamiltoniano, ed. Vittore Branca (Florence, 1976) 718.

since both were paintings in which Mary acted as Ruler of the Order surrounded by its saints. At Montesièpi (fig. 12), in a limited, cloistered male community, the juxtaposition of Mary and Eve was a rather expansive allegory, in which the association of Eve with the weakness of human flesh allowed an expression of the monks' own need for Mary's advocacy. But in the public church of the convent of S. Aurea (fig. 68), where that flesh existed, with all its worrying weakness, in the form of the real nuns of the community, the same range of associations was potentially much more problematic, and the composition altered accordingly.

Yet however logical it may seem that female and male viewers had different relations to the imagery, two very different texts suggest the difficulties of such an extrapolation. The first is a miracle story by Caesarius of Heisterbach, in which the German nobleman Henry of Wied is talking with his wife; she begins, "as is the way with women," to deride Eve's weakness. Henry defends Eve, saying anyone would have fallen if tempted so harshly, and to prove his point he dares his wife to take on a much easier prohibition: she must promise to keep out of the filthy pond of their castle and he will pay her forty marks of silver, but she will lose the same amount if she cannot resist. Needless to say, within a manner of weeks she's in the dirty water, and he points out she resisted much bravely than Eve to a much lesser temptation.¹⁵

Conversely, some three hundred years later, in the early 1450s, the learned woman Isotta Nogarola is the one to take Eve's side against a male detractor, in an epistolary debate with the Venetian Ludovico Foscarini on the first parents' relative sins. Even here, however, Nogarola's defense is very

¹⁵Caesarius I, 276-278.

much of her time and culture: she defends Eve by arguing she was created weaker and more imperfect than Adam, and "where there is less intellect and less constancy, there is less sin." It is Ludovico who defends Eve's reason, moral will, and constancy, albeit to condemn her more thoroughly.¹⁶

If nothing else, such examples stress how little the responses of real men and women can be predicted solely on the basis of sex. But both tales have a much more fundamental, and important, point: for both Henry and Isotta, Eve's fundamental strength or weakness is accepted, not judged, as a fact of her, and their, human condition. Perhaps then, when faced with this particular iconographical form of Mary as the Second Eve, we need to remember this fundamental understanding, which provided the reassurance and resonance of Mary enthroned with Eve ensconced at her feet for Trecento and early Quattrocento Christians: it allowed them to reassert their own hope for Mary's advocacy through the example of their own shared Mother, the first, and greatest, among those whom Mary had helped to redeem.

¹⁶Isotta Nogarola, "Of the Equal or Unequal Sin of Adam and Eve" *Her Immaculate Hand: Selected Works By and About The Women Humanists of Quattrocento Italy*, eds. Margaret L. King and Albert Rabil, Jr. (Binghamton, NY, 1983) 59-69; see 57-59 for the two writers and the circumstances of the debate, which was a traditional one.

APPENDIX

ADDITIONAL PANELS OF THE VIRGIN WITH EVE AT HER FEET

This section is intended to provide basic iconographic and bibliographic information on those small panels not discussed in detail in the main text, notably because they had little to add to the discussion of imagery, patronage, and audience. In all cases, they are undocumented before the nineteenth century; several are in private collections and not accessible to scholars.

The works are listed by school, beginning with the Sienese, the most extensive group and the earliest examples. In each case the work is described, and bibliographic information is provided for both the painting and its putative author.

THE SIENESE:

The three earliest surviving examples of Mary with Eve at her feet are Sienese: the Montesiepi fresco, probably of the 1330s, the Montefalco Coronation, and Lippo Vanni's panel of 1358. Even allowing for the inevitable accidents of survival, this suggests the imagery was first popular among Sienese workshops, and later works included here make it clear the iconography was still attractive to artists in that city in the last decades of the Trecento. When the archaising artist Giovanni di Paolo illustrated the Mystic Rose of Dante's Paradiso, Canto XXXII, for one of the Aragonese kings of

Naples around 1445, his work, uniquely, drew on this local tradition, showing a crowned Eve lying under Mary's feet (fig. 83).¹

Recently there has been a trend to suggest Sieneese provenance for works previously ascribed to other schools, especially the ORVIETAN, composed of artists who worked on the Duomo of that city; thus a small panel previously attributed to Cola di Petruccioli is now given to Paolo di Giovanni Fei. Despite these changed attributions, there remain at least two known instances of Orvietan artists using the iconography, at Magione in 1371 (unknown, possibly Andrea di Giovanni), and at Pisa in 1390 (Piero di Puccio).

Paolo di Giovanni Fei

There are three Mary/Eve works now normally attributed to Paolo di Giovanni Fei or his close circle. Fei is exceptionally well documented: he is first recorded in 1369, listed as "pictor" among the members of the Consiglio Generale of Siena, and must presumably have been more than twenty years old at that time in order to have been elected.² Fei was a very successful painter. There is only one surviving signed work, the Madonna and Child with Four Saints originally from Serre di Rapolano (now Pinacoteca, Siena); but several other works are recorded between the 1390s and 1410, and he is known to have worked for the Opera del Duomo, and to have held various

¹Giovanni di Paolo di Grazia, attributed. Dante's Commedia, Paradiso, Canto XXXII, Yates Thompson MS 36, folio 187r. British Library, London. See: John Pope-Hennessy, Paradiso: The Illuminations to Dante's Divine Comedy (London, 1993) 56-60; Peter Brieger, Millard Meiss, and Charles Singleton, Illuminated Manuscripts of the Divine Comedy (Princeton, NJ, 1969) 269-276; Guldan 129, 216. For Giovanni see also: Gotico a Siena 358-371; van Os (1990) II, 48-51 and passim.

²Pietro Torriti, "Un'aggiunta a Paolo di Giovanni Fei" Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Roberto Salvini (Florence, 1984) 211-212; Gotico a Siena 295-298, 296; Michael Mallory, The Sieneese Painter Paolo di Giovanni Fei (c. 1345-1411) (New York and London, 1976).

posts in the Sienese government.³ He made a will on June 1, 1411 in favour of his wife and seven children, and was dead by December 1412, when his wife is recorded as a widow.⁴

1. Madonna and Child with Saints Peter, Paul, John the Baptist, John the Evangelist, Agnes, Catherine, Lucy, a Virgin Martyr, and Nine Angels; in the spandrels the Annunciation. 86.9 x 59 cm. Lehman Collection, Metropolitan Museum, New York, catalogue 1975. I. 23.

The Lehman panel (fig. 84) is small and jewel-like, in one of the ornate frames that seem to have been a specialty of the artist and other Sienese painters at the end of the Trecento: it is worked in pastiglia, with coloured glass insets, details which recall the description of the frame of Lippo Vanni's 1358 triptych before restoration.⁵ The Virgin and Child are enthroned against a red and gold cloth held by a crowd of angels. The Infant holds the Virgin's breast in one hand, and looks to the viewer; He has one foot crossed over Mary's arm. There are four male saints at the front of the throne, the same Sienese saints found at Montesiépi and elsewhere: an elderly male saint writing in a book, probably John the Evangelist, Peter with a large key, Paul with a large sword and John the Baptist. Four female saints stand behind them: Agnes with a small roundel with the lamb, a crowned Catherine with book and

³Gotico a Siena 295.

⁴Gotico a Siena 295.

⁵Timothy J. Newman et al., Italian Renaissance Frames (New York, 1990) 34; John Pope-Hennessy, The Robert Lehman Collection 2 vols. (New York, 1987), I, 38-39; Mallory 110-112 and 232-233; George Szabó, The Robert Lehman Collection (A Guide) (New York, 1975) 16-17; Guldán 132; Berenson (1968) I, 127-130; Wilhelm Reinhold Valentiner, Catalogue of Early Italian Paintings Exhibited at the Duveen Galleries, April- May 1924 (New York, 1926), n. 28; Van Marle II, 531.

palm, a saint with a small lamp or dish, probably Lucy, and another with no discernible attributes, sometimes identified as Ursula;⁶ her fingers are raised and held together, as if she once held some slim object, possibly an arrow. Eve lies in the cut-out space below, now dark but perhaps once green. She is partly upright and rigidly frontal; she has a hexagonal halo and a transparent white shift with a fur thrown over it, and holds a fig branch in one hand and a scroll with EVA in the other. Paul's sword seems to pierce the small but bushy tree with the snake coiled around it at her side. In the roundels of the frame are a slightly bowing Gabriel and Mary, both approximately bust length.

The panel is in good condition, although the back is now smeared with wax. There is however a photo in the Lehman archives, apparently unnoticed by recent writers, labeled "Before treatment at March 1956." This shows the back was divided into four compartments by horizontal and vertical battens, but had none of the elaborate decorative work of the front frame. At that time it also had a crack, still visible, running almost the whole length of the panel, and butterfly joints had been used to patch it; there may also have been a painted marbled effect.⁷

The attribution to Paolo di Giovanni Fei is universally accepted, and the painting is usually dated to the 1390s, relatively early in the artist's career.⁸ It is first recorded in the Chigi-Saracini Collection in Siena; later acquired by the Florentine Luigi Grassi, it had been bought by Mr. and Mrs. A.E. Goodhart

⁶Mallory 232; Valentiner n. 28.

⁷The photo is labelled on the back: "Photography by John D. Schiff 107 West 86th St. New York 24, NY. Endicott 2-0485. Negative number 511270 112." There was also what appears to be masking tape on the right horizontal batten. Upon discovering this photo I discussed it briefly with Lawrence Kanter, Director of the Lehman Collection, who suggested the photo shows evidence of polychromy, although this may also have been an effect of raking light on the grain of the wood when the photo was taken.

⁸Pope-Hennessy (1987) 37-38; Mallory 110.

of New York by 1924. It was bequeathed by Mrs. Goodhart to Lehman in 1952.⁹

2. Madonna and Child with Bartholomew, Catherine, Urban V, a Bishop, and Two Angels, and Eve with Cain and Abel. 46 x 20 cm. Present whereabouts uncertain.

The Madonna is nursing the child (fig. 85), and two angels stand with praying hands behind the cloth of honour.¹⁰ There are four saints; in front are Bartholomew with book and knife, and a crowned Catherine with book and palm. The two behind are an old hermit in black and grey(?), probably Anthony Abbot, and a Pope holding a reliquary with the heads of Peter and Paul; Mallory has identified him as Urban V, and because he has a round halo, suggests a terminus post quem of 1370, the year of Urban's death.¹¹ Again according to Mallory, the panel shows traces of wings once attached; he reports it to be in good condition.¹²

This image shows an interesting variation in the portrayal of Eve. Her position is classic, and she wears the transparent dress, polygonal halo and small cap or crown seen in the Magione or Lehman image. Also typically, she holds a scroll in her right hand and a branch in her left. But she is here shown

⁹Pope-Hennessy (1987) 37-38.

¹⁰Schiller 193; Guldán 133-134 and 217; Berenson (1968) I, 127-130; Esche 67; Van Marle V, 106, and "La scuola pittorica orvietana del '300" Bollettino d'arte III (1923-4), 305-335; Paul Schubring, "Italienische Bilder des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts in Museum Schütgen in Köln" Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst 25 (1912) 129-136; Paul Schubring, "Opere sconosciute di Giovanni di Paolo e del Vecchietta" Rassegna d'arte 12 (1912) 162-164.

¹¹Mallory 214; it might also be supposed the Pope would be shown with a full halo after his beatification, rather than immediately after his death.

¹²Mallory 214.

with Cain and Abel, and instead of her name or the usual reference to Genesis 3, 13, "serpens decipit me," her banner reads "CONDOLOR. PA(r?)," probably to be understood as a vernacular rendering of "cum dolore paries filios," God's words to Eve in Genesis 3, 16. The tie to the specific childbirth curse is unique, stressing the distinct nature of the two women's motherhood.¹³

At the beginning of this century the panel was in the Schnütgen Museum in Cologne; it was sold in Brussels on March 29, 1949, and reappeared in a private collection in San Marino, where Guldan listed it in the 1960s.¹⁴ The earliest publications are as "school of Ambrogio Lorenzetti," and Van Marle suggested the Orvietan Cola Petruccioli, documented from 1372 to 1401.¹⁵ It is now generally considered to be a Sienese work, and attributed to Fei or an artist close to him;¹⁶ from a comparison of photographs, it seems possible the author was also that of the work attributed to Niccolò di Buonaccorso (n.4 below).

¹³Schiller 194.

¹⁴For the sale: Mallory 214, and Guldan 217.

¹⁵For the attribution to the Lorenzetti school, see both 1912 articles by Schubring (as in nt.10); for the attribution to Cola Petruccioli: Van Marle V, 106, followed Guldan 217. Cola is documented in Orvieto as an assistant of Ugolino di Prete Ilario from 1372 to 1378, and in 1380 was working alongside Andrea di Giovanni, possible author of the Magione fresco, in the works of Duomo; he had left Orvieto by the 1380s and lived and worked in Perugia until his death in 1401. There are several surviving signed and dated works, a 1380 Crucifixion in the crypt of the Orvieto Duomo, a 1385 diptych in Spello, and a Crucifixion from Sant'Agostino in Perugia of 1398. See: C. Fratini (1983) 169-184; P.P. Donati 3-17; Giovanni Previtali, "Affreschi di Cola Petruccioli" *Paragone* 193 (1966) 33-43; Carli (1965) 87-88; Gnoli (1923) 85-86; Umberto Gnoli, "La data della morte di Cola Petruccioli" *Bollettino d'arte* 3 (1924) 335. Longhi's "Tracciato orvietano" does not mention this work, but does mention what he calls Van Marle's untenable attributions.

¹⁶The attribution to Fei: Berenson (1968) 128; it is linked to Fei's circle by Mallory 214.

3. Tree of Life Triptych with the Four Evangelists and the Twelve Apostles, with the Virgin, Mary Magdalene, Adam and Eve at the Base. Centre panel 59 x 23 cm. Niedersächsisches Landesgalerie, Hannover.

Strictly speaking, this is not an image of Mary with Eve, and might best be described as a cross between a Marian and a Christological narrative, but it is included because it is obviously related to these compositions, and shows how the Mary/Eve iconography could be used to wider ends.

The triptych is intact and in its original frame (fig. 86);¹⁷ it is uncontroversially attributed to Paolo di Giovanni Fei's workshop, and dated to c. 1400.¹⁸ In the wings are the Adoration of the Child by Mary and Joseph, the Adoration of the Magi, the Carrying of the Cross, and the Descent into Limbo; the Annunciation is shown in the gables. In the centre panel is an image of Christ on the cross, here presented as the Tree of Life. The twelve apostles are framed in its circling boughs, while above the transverse are the four evangelists, and at the apex is a pelican tearing its breast to feed its young. All the biblical figures hold scrolls with inscriptions. Each evangelist has a verse from his book, reported by Grohn as: "Missus est angelus gabriel a deo in civitat" (Luke 1, 26), "In principio erat verbum et verb(um) erat apud deu(m) et Deus erat v(er)b(um) (John 1,1), "maria magdalene et maria jacobae et salome eme" (Mark 16,1); and finally "Cum natus esset yesus in bethele(m) iude(e) in diebus erodis Re" (Matthew 2,1). The apostles each hold a verse of

¹⁷Hans Werner Grohn, Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum Hannover: Die italienischen Gemälde (Hannover, 1995) 119-122; Gertrude Coor, "Bemerkungen zu einem ungewöhnlichen italienischen Triptychon in der Niedersächsischen Landesgalerie Hannover" Niederdeutsche Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte 2 (1962) 152-171; Gert von der Osten, Katalog der Gemälde alter Meister in der Nieder-ähsischen Landesgalerie Hannover (Hannover, 1954) 118-119; Guldán 133-135, 217-218; Esche 67.

¹⁸Grohn 122.

what is still called the Apostles' Creed; it begins at the top left with Peter's Credo and snakes down to Mathias's Amen: credo i(n) deu(m) patre(m) o(mn)ipote(n)te(m) creatore(m) celj et ter(r)e/ Et jseum christum filiu(m) unicu(m) Dominu(m) nostru(m)/ Qui conceptu(s) de sp(irit)u s(an)c(t)o natu(s) ex Maria Virgine/ Passus su(b) pocio pilato crucifixu(s) mortu(us) et sepultu(s)/...scendit ad i(n)ferna tertia die resurecit a mortuis/ Ascendit ad celos sedet a dextera(m) dei patris o(mn)ipote(n)tis/nturu(s) est judicare vivos et mortuos/ Credo ini spiritu(m) sanctu(m)/ Santa ecclesia(m) chatolica(m)/ S(an)c(t)o(rum) comunione(m) pe(r)mesione(m) peccatoru(m)/ Carnis resurettione(m)/ Vitam eternam. Amen. Each scroll also bears the figure's name in smaller letters at its base.

There are four figures at the bottom of the cross. The first is Adam, an haloed old man in cloth and fur, with a fig branch in one hand and a hoe and banderole in the other; this reads: "Mulier deceptit me et comedi." Below him, Eve lies in a familiar posture; she too is haloed with a small diadem over her hair, with a long white dress and fur across the shoulders and back. She also has a fig branch and banderole, but where "Serpens deceptit" might be expected after Adam's words, her scroll refers to Mary with a verse of the Ave maris stella: "Funda nos in pace, mutans Evae nomen Maria." Kneeling to either side of the cross are Mary and Mary Magdalene; the Virgin gestures to the cross and holds a scroll with "Eva lacrimis Maria gaudiens in ve(n)tre portavit," while the Magdalene's hands are held together in prayer around a banner with "Demissa su(n)t michi peccata multa qu(o)n(iam) dilexi multu(m)."

In the major study of this work, Gertrude Coor related its central image to the Franciscan devotion to the Tree of Life. Both Bonaventure of Bagnoregio and Ubertino da Casale wrote treatises with that name, where the

episodes of the Life of Christ were divided into a mnemonic scheme based on a tree of twelve branches (or fruits).¹⁹ Examples of this imagery are common in Franciscan houses, and include Taddeo Gaddi's fresco in the refectory of S. Croce in Florence, the panel by Pacino di Buonaguida from the Convent of Monticelli of the same city, and Antonio Vite's fresco in the chapter house of Pistoia, to name just three.²⁰ The Tree of Life is of course mentioned in Eden in Genesis, and scenes from Genesis are included in the Monticelli image. But the composition can also be related to the legend of the True Cross, which told that Golgotha was placed over Adam's tomb, and that the tree which led to human downfall in the Garden of Eden eventually became the cross of Christ's crucifixion. This is based on such apocrypha as the Vita Adae, and recounted in such common sources as the Golden Legend; it also is the subject of famous cycles in Volterra, S. Croce in Florence (by Taddeo's son Agnolo), and at Arezzo.²¹ The figures at the bottom here in fact express the stages in a cycle of sin, penitence, and absolution: Adam has sinned and is sentenced to work, Eve awaits her transformation through Mary, the Madgalene has found forgiveness and it has all come about by Mary's consent and Christ's suffering. The underlying salvation narrative is troped in the wings: Mary consents, the Child

¹⁹See Coor and: Rab Hatfield, "The Tree of Life and the Holy Cross: Franciscan Spirituality in the Trecento and the Quattrocento" in Verdon and Henderson 132-160. Bonaventure's work exists in modern translation: Bonaventure, The Soul's Journey into God, The Tree of Life, The Life of Saint Francis, trans. Ewert Cousins (London, 1978) 117-175.

²⁰For these cycles: Ladis 171-182; Marcucci 18-21; and Lucia Gai, ed., S. Francesco: La chiesa e il convento in Pistoia (Pistoia, 1993) 110-160.

²¹For the theme see Hatfield; for the paintings: Mariagiulia Burresi et al., Volterra: la Cappella della Croce in S. Francesco (Volterra, 1991); Bruce Cole, Agnolo Gaddi (Oxford, 1977) 21-25 and 79-81. The imagery of Adam and Eve at the foot of the cross had a long life, as is shown by a large print of 1647 by Claude Mellan, where Adam, Eve, the serpent, and death are shown at the base of the cross: see Adam et Eve de Dürer à Chagall: Gravures de la Bibliothèque Nationale, 4 juillet-5 octobre, 1992 (Paris, 1992) 87-88, where the composition is somewhat wrongly described as "tout à fait originale."

is born and adored, suffers and dies, and finally descends to carry his ancestors Adam, Eve, the Baptist, and others out of Hell. All of this is also recounted in the Credo prayer: thus the Annunciation, birth, and finding of the empty tomb with Mary Magdalene and the Virgin brought together are all given in both word and image.

4. Niccolò di Buonaccorso, attributed. Madonna and Child with the Four Evangelists and their Attributes, and Six Angels. 52 x 24.1 cm. Present whereabouts unknown.

Niccolò di Buonaccorso is listed in the Guild of Sienese painters in 1356, and documented in the Sienese government in 1372 and 1376; he died in 1388, when he was probably still quite young, and there is one dated work, a panel of 1387 now in Sant'Andrea in Montecchio near Siena.²²

The Virgin and Child are enthroned between two low benches (fig. 87), with six angels behind. Mary is holding a small flower in her right hand, and Christ stands on her left knee and reaches toward her. On the benches are the Evangelists, each with his symbol and a book: Luke and John to the Virgin's right hand, and Matthew and Mark at her left. Below, in a deeply cut-out space, Eve is shown with an octagonal halo, small cap, and transparent shift; her upper body is shown frontally but her legs are in profile. She holds the fig branch and a now effaced banderole, and the snake emerges from a

²²Miklós Boskovits, Frühe italienische Malerei. Gemäldegalerie Berlin, ed. and trans. Erich Schleier (Berlin, 1987) 140-142; L'art gothique siennois: enluminure, peinture, orfèvrerie, sculpture (Avignon, 26 juin-2 octobre, 1982) (Florence, 1983) 261-263; Miklós Boskovits, "Su Niccolò di Buonaccorso, Benedetto di Bindo e la pittura senese del primo Quattrocento" Paragone 359-361 (1980) 3-22; Hayden B.J. Maginnis, "A Reidentified Panel by Niccolò di Buonaccorso" Source 1 (1982) 18-20; Bruce Cole and Adelheid Medicus Gealt, "A new Triptych by Niccolò di Buonaccorso and a Problem" BM 119 (1977) 184-187.

small tree between her awkwardly rendered legs; this depiction and placement of the snake recurs in the Cleveland panel by Carlo da Camerino.²³

This panel was sold at Christie's on July 16, 1971, with the attribution to Niccolò and as lot 94; the buyer was listed as "Andrews," and the price as 3200 guineas, or 8060 American dollars.²⁴ It had previously been sold at Sotheby's in the Harris Sale, 24 and 25 October, 1950, attributed to Paolo di Giovanni Fei, when it was bought by a J. Hunt.²⁵ In style and iconography, the work is obviously related to the panels attributed to Fei, especially n. 2.

THE LUCCHESI:

5. Angelo Puccinelli, attributed. Virgin and Child with Peter, John the Baptist, Nicholas, Paul, Gerard of Villamagna, Agnes (?), Catherine, Agatha, and Six Angels; in the gable, the Crucifixion. 98 x 53 cm with frame. Lindenau-Museum, Altenburg, n. 49.

Angelo Puccinelli (or di Puccinello) is documented from 1379 until 1407; significantly, the first of these references places him in Siena, working on a "San Piero" for the Duomo, where he might have learned of the Mary/Eve iconography.²⁶ Puccinelli seems to have been among the most sought-after

²³See the Introduction and Chapter Three for this work.

²⁴Fine Pictures by Old Masters, Sale on Friday, July 16, 1971, 34. Sold to "Andrews" for 3200 guineas, \$U.S. 8060. Both Professor Andrew Martindale and I contacted Christie's to obtain information about this panel, but they are not able to release the name of the purchaser.

²⁵Witt Library photo archive, under "Paolo di Giovanni Fei."

²⁶For Angelo, see the excellent study by Graziano Concioni et al., Arte e pittura nel medioevo lucchese (Lucca, 1994) 320-323; and also: Maurizia Tazartes, "Profilo della pittura lucchese del Trecento" Richerche di storia dell'arte 50 (1993) 89-102; Antonino Caleca, "Presenze a Lucca nella seconda metà del secolo: Angelo Puccinelli e Giuliano di Simone" Il secolo di Castruccio. Fonti e documenti di storia lucchese, ed. Clara Baracchini (Lucca, 1982) 202-206;

painters in Lucca, and he is known to have worked for several of his home city's most important citizens; there are two surviving signed and dated works, a 1386 Dormitio Virginis, in S. Maria Forisportam, and a 1393 Madonna and Child with Nicholas of Bari, Lucy, Michael, and Augustine, in nearby Lunigiana.²⁷

Apart from the loss of the frame, the Altenburg panel is in good condition (fig. 88).²⁸ A crowned Mary sits on a deep throne against a cloth of gold; the Child on her knee turns and gestures toward Catherine of Alexandria and holds a small bird. There are three small angels on each side, and a total of eight saints. In the front row are Peter with a book and the keys, John with a long scroll inscribed "Ecce agnus dei.....mundi," Nicholas with a crozier and the golden balls, and Paul with a sword and four epistles, each carefully delineated.²⁹ Behind them are Gerard of Villamagna in a Franciscan habit with a crutch and prayer beads, a female saint in red holding her robe in one hand and a palm in the other, Catherine with crown, book, palm, and wheel, and Agatha with palm and a tray with her breasts.³⁰ Below them, Eve lies on her right side, wrapped in a bluish-grey fur with a red lining and naked from the

Maria Letizia Regola, "Due documenti per il trittico con lo 'Sposalizio mistico di Santa Caterina' di Angelo Puccinelli" Prospettiva 8 (1977) 46-48; Alvar Gonzalez-Palacios, "Posizione di Angelo Puccinelli" Antichità viva (May-June 1971) 3-9; Federico Zeri, "Angelo Puccinelli a Siena" Bollettino d'arte 49 (1964) 229-235.

²⁷Concioni et al. 320.

²⁸In addition to those sources on Angelo above: Boskovits (1975) 247 nt. 253; Berenson (1968) I, 349-350; Guldán 132-134, 216-217; Oertel 181-184; Esche 61, nt. 179; Crowe and Cavalcaselle 132, nt.3; Paul Schubring, "Italienische Bilder" (as in nt. 10) 132-135; Herzoglich Sachsen-Altenburgisches Museum (Lindenau-Stiftung) (Altenburg, 1898) 37-39.

²⁹This slightly unusual iconography is repeated in a panel of Paul in the same collection, attributed to Alvaro di Portogallo, active in Tuscany around 1420: see Oertel 138-139.

³⁰For the identification of Gerard of Villamagna: Oertel 181; this probably rests on a similar figure labeled "Gerardus" in the same collection, in a panel of the Madonna and Child by the Florentine Paolo Schiavo: Oertel 142-143. See also Kaftal (1965) 509-512.

waist up. She has an octagonal halo, and holds a scroll with "Serpens decepit me et comedi" in her right hand, as at Magione, while her left is raised and her head turned toward the serpent at her left. Running around the gradino is a fragmentary inscription: "fructus illius dulcis," which a nineteenth-century source recorded as "s...quem...sc...et fructus illius dulcis," which no doubt referred to Mary and Christ.³¹ In the gable above is a Crucifix flanked by Mary and John. The panel's most striking aspect is the range of colours and textures: Paul wears blue and lilac, Peter is in blue and gold, and both Nicholas and Catherine wear brocaded cloth of gold.

The attribution, made by Offner, has been universally accepted, and the work is typically dated to the late 1370s or early 1380s, making it an early work in Angelo's career.³² The panel is not documented before its acquisition in Rome in 1845; according to Oertel, the back is divided into four sections and painted to resemble porphyry, an arrangement reminiscent of the Lehman Paolo di Giovanni Fei; there is also an export seal.³³

Giuliano di Simone Ricci

Giuliano di Simone Ricci is first documented in 1383, when he is listed among the four members of a society of painters in Lucca, and not yet emancipated from his father; he is last documented in 1397, when he created another society with his younger brother Alessio and the Sienese painter Benedetto di Giovanni.³⁴ Giuliano left one signed and dated work, a 1389

³¹Herzoglich Sachsen-Altenburgisches Museum 37-3.

³²The attribution was made by Offner, in Schorr, 97-98; for the date: Oertel 183-184

³³Oertel 182.

panel of the Madonna *lactans* in Castiglione di Garfagna; but a polyptych of the Madonna and Child from the Lucchese Ospedale di S. Luca can be dated fairly securely between 1392 and 1395.³⁵ He was probably slightly younger than Angelo Puccinelli, but the two are closely linked.³⁶

There are three works attributed to Simone, all fairly close to the Altenburg panel in both scale and iconography.

6. Madonna and Child with Saints Catherine, John the Baptist, Francis, a Female Martyr and Four Angels; in the gable, the Crucifixion with Mary and John. 95 x 78 cm. Galleria Nazionale, Parma, n. 443.

The surface of this panel is in excellent condition (fig. 89); it is slightly bowed and with small losses near the Virgin in the gable, and some cracking at the sides, but its dominant gold tonality is well preserved.³⁷ The Virgin and Child are seated against a suspended cloth of gold; the Child plays with a small bird. Two angels float on either side, and below them are four saints: at Mary's right hand are a virgin martyr who must be Catherine, with a palm, a small book, and vestiges of a broken wheel before her, and John the Baptist with cross and scroll, on which ECCE ANGUS DE(i) is just visible; he

³⁴Concioni et al. 329-330; see also Caleca and Tazartes (as in nt. 26), and: Boskovits (1975) 247 nt. 236; Alvar Gonzalez-Palacios, "Percorso di Giuliano di Simone" Arte illustrata 45/46 (1971) 49-59; Silvia Meloni Trkulja, "Una 'Madonna' e mezzo affresco di Giuliano di Simone lucchese" Paragone 255 (1971) 61-64; G. Ardinghi, "Antichi dipinti nelle Chiese di provincia" La Provincia di Lucca 5 (1965) 75-78; G. Ardinghi, "La Madonna di Castiglione di Garfagnana" La Provincia di Lucca 4 (1964) n. pag.

³⁵Concioni et al. 329-330; see Ardinghi (1964) for the 1389 painting.

³⁶For their relations see Caleca and Tazartes (as in nt. 26).

³⁷Berenson (1968) I, 196; Armando Ottaviano Quintavalle, Mostra Parmense di dipinti noti ed ignoti dal XIV al XVIII secolo (Parma, 1948) 30; Armando Ottaviano Quintavalle, La Regia Galleria di Parma (Rome, 1939) 187; Ugo Procacci, "Opere sconosciute d'arte toscana" Rivista d'arte 14 (1932) 341-353; Guldan 132-134.

gestures to Christ with his right hand. Across from them are Francis of Assisi with a book, cross, and radiant stigmata, and another female saint with a palm. Eve lies on her elbow on the flowery ground, twisting so her face is in profile and her back presented to the viewer; she is wrapped in a dappled fur, clearly distinguished from the long-haired fur on the Baptist, and a cloven foot is carefully indicated. She has a nimbus of glowing rays around her head, and gestures to the erect snake and small fig tree either at or between her knees. The words SERPENS DESCEPIT ME (sic) in gold emerge from her mouth. In the gable above, as at Altenburg, is the Crucifix flanked by Mary and John.

The attribution was made by Procacci and has been generally accepted; the panel is usually dated to the period around the 1389 Garfagnana Madonna.³⁸ It has been suggested that the painting entered the Parma collection from Florence, bought for Ferdinando di Borbone (i.e. Bourbon), or else that it was sent from Lucca by Maria Luisa of Borbone or Carlo III.³⁹

7. Fragment of a Madonna and Child with Saints Mary Magdalene, Nicholas, Dorothy, and Peter, and Four Musician Angels. Painted surface 45.5 x 57.5 cm. Réserves, Musée du Louvre, Paris, MI 407.

Unlike the Parma work, this panel has suffered (fig. 90). There are significant paint losses at the right and especially the left bottom corners, and it has been cut down both top and bottom.⁴⁰ Originally, however, it had a

³⁸Procacci 346; Quintavalle 30.

³⁹The first suggestion: *Mostra parmense* 30; the second, Meloni Trkulja, 63 nt. 3.

⁴⁰Berenson (1968) I, 196; *Exposition de 700 tableaux de toutes les écoles antérieures à 1800 tirés des Réserves du Département des peintures*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1960) 23; P. Misciatelli, "Un'Eva lorenzettiana nel Museo del Louvre" *La Diana* (1930) 215-218; Louis Hauteceur, *Musée national du Louvre, catalogue des peintures exposées dans les galeries, II: école italienne et école espagnole* (Paris, 1926); Seymour de Ricci, *Description raisonnée des peintures du Louvre. I: Italie et Espagne*. Paris, 1913; Frédéric Reiset, *Notice des tableaux du musée*

gable of 23 x 17.8 cm with a crucifixion, discovered in 1971, similar to the Parma and Altenburg works.⁴¹ Again, Mary and Christ sit against a cloth of gold with little indication of a throne; here the Child is nursing. There are four floating angels with musical instruments: a lute, a viol, another lute and a harp. At the Virgin's right hand are Mary Magdalene in a red cloak with the unguent jar, and Nicholas with crozier and balls; on the other side are Peter with book and keys, and probably Dorothy in grey with a white veil and holding red and white flowers in the folded cloth.⁴² Eve lies on her right side against a flowered ground, in a shaggy fur with a cloven foot around her legs; she has a scalloped gold halo, and lifts herself to look back and gesture toward the towering snake. The words SERPENS DECEPIT ME rise up into the cloth of the throne.

This work was attributed to Guiliano by Sylvie Béguin in 1960, and is dated to very much the same period as Parma; it entered the Louvre in 1861, and had been part of the collection put together by Giampietro Campana, once Director of the Monte de Pietà in Rome.⁴³ It is possible this work is closer chronologically to the Puccinelli than the Parma panel, as both the Crucifix and Eve are iconographically closer to it.

Napoleon III exposés dans les salles de la Colonnade du Louvre (Paris, 1863); Guldán 132-134.

⁴¹This reconstruction was made by Gonzalez-Palacios 46 (as in nt. 34), who proposed that a small crucifixion panel from the Leegenhoek Collection on the market in 1971 was the missing gable. According to a letter of 20 April 1972 in the files of the Department of Paintings of the Louvre, this crucifix was purchased by Clara and Marino dall'Oglio of Milan.

⁴²The catalogue 700 tableaux 23 calls her "s. Elisabeth (ou Dorothée)."

⁴³For the attribution 700 tableaux 23. For the Campana collection: Gianpaolo Nadalini, "De Rome au Louvre: les avatars du Musée Campana entre 1857 et 1862" Histoire de l'art 21/22 (1993) 47-58; Murielle Pianazza, "Giovanni Pietro Campana Collezionista, Archeologo, Banchiere, e il suo legame con Firenze" MKIF 37 (1993) 433-473.

8. Madonna and Child with Saints James the Great, Michael, and two Female Saints. Dimensions and present location unknown.

This arched panel (fig. 91) is illustrated by Berenson, who listed it as "Leghorn, Larderel Collection (ex);" it is not included in other discussions of Giuliano's work.⁴⁴ Mary holds the Child: she has a gold band on her forehead, and her hair is completely covered by her mantle. Christ sits upright and seems older than in other works, and holds a small bird as at Parma; mother and Son seem to float against a circle of cherubim. At their right are James the Great with staff and book, and a female saint (Catherine?) with a small diadem, book and palm; and on the left another female saint (Margaret?) holding a small cross, and Michael, holding a lance and orb and standing on a large, coiled dragon. Eve sits up on her elbow against the flowered ground, wrapped in a cloth; uniquely, she is portrayed taking the fruit from the S-shaped snake, which has acquired small arms to pass it to her.

THE FLORENTINES:

The Florentine examples are both atypical and later than the other works; they are of lesser quality, and one is a very late domestic tabernacle.

9. Master of the Straus Madonna, attributed. Madonna lactans with Saints James the Greater, John the Baptist, Dorothy, Julian the

⁴⁴Berenson (1968) I, 196. Fiorella Superbi Gioffredi of the Villa I Tatti Berenson archives has kindly confirmed the photo in Florence has only that information on its reverse. (Letter to the author, November 18, 1993). The Larderel Collection was broken up before the Second World War, and I have been unable to trace the panel's whereabouts, but I would like to thank Dottoressa Gioffredi for kindly helping with my inquiries.

Hospitaller, and Two Angels. 52.4 x 41.3 cm. Astley-Cheetham Gallery, Stalybridge.

The Master of the Straus Madonna is a personality constructed essentially by Richard Offner, so-called after a panel once in the Straus Collection in New York, and now in Houston. He is considered to have worked in and around Florence from c. 1390 to 1420, in the circle of Lorenzo Monaco, Gherardo Starnina, and finally Masolino, and there is one dated work, a 1405 Man of Sorrows in the Narodowe Museum, Warsaw.⁴⁵

The Stalybridge painting is now in a modern frame, but otherwise in fairly good condition (fig. 92); it uses a limited range of tones, essentially the three primary colours, gold, and white.⁴⁶ Mary is nursing the Child; they sit on an elaborate throne with a mandorla of red and blue cherubim behind them, an angel at each side, and a small vase at their feet. To their right are James the Great with book and staff and John the Baptist with cross, pointing to the Child; at their left are a female saint with a flower garland in her hair and more flowers in the fold of her dress, probably Dorothy, and a male saint in a red cloak with a sword, probably Julian the Hospitaller. Eve lies in a transparent dress with a fig branch as her only attribute, although both she and

⁴⁵For the artist: Richard Fremantle, Florentine Gothic Painters from Giotto to Masaccio: a Guide to Painting in and near Florence, 1300 to 1450 (London, 1975) 303-312 (who also attributes the Giuliano di Simone in the Louvre to this artist); Boskovits (1975) 362-366; Richard Offner "The Mostra del Tesoro di Firenze sacra II" BM 63 (1933) 166-178.

⁴⁶Early Italian Paintings and Works of Art 1300-1480 (London, 1983) 44; Medieval and Early Renaissance Treasures in the North West (Whitworth Art Gallery, 15 January-28 December 1976) n. 81; (St. John Gore) The Art of Painting in Florence and Siena from 1250 to 1500 (London, 1965) 9; Michael Quinton Smith, "The Winter Exhibition at the Royal Academy I: Paintings of St. Fina and of Eve Recumbent" BM 104 (1962) 62-66; and a response to Smith: Gertrude Coor, "Neither a Rose nor an Apple but a Fig" BM 104 (1962) 305; Mina Gregori, "Dai primitivi a Picasso alla Royal Academy" Antichità viva 1/3 (1962) 41-45, 43; Primitives to Picasso: An Exhibition from Municipal and University Collections in Great Britain (London, 1962) 200; Guldan 132, 134.

Mary share the same type of round and punch-marked halo. The work is perhaps closest, surprisingly, to the Guiliano di Simone works: the posture of Eve and to a lesser extent the placement and figure of James the Great recall n. 8 above.

The back of the panel shows it is composed of three separate planks with cardboard at the edges; it bears a number of exhibition stickers and a circular Milan customs seal, but unfortunately the date cannot be made out.⁴⁷ The painting was bought by a local man, J.F. Cheetham, whose collection founded the Stalybridge Gallery after the death of his sister Agnes in 1931; the attribution was made by Offner in 1962, and a date of c. 1400-1410 has been proposed.⁴⁸

10. Paolo Schiavo, attributed. Tabernacle with Madonna and Child Relief and painted frame with God the Father, Two Angels, and Eve. Frame 36.2 x 17.8 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, A.45-1926.

Paolo Schiavo is documented from his birth in 1397 until 1478, and almost every writer since Vasari has linked his style to that of Masolino.⁴⁹ He is listed in the painters' guild in 1429; there is a signed fresco of 1436 in S. Miniato al Monte, and another of 1448 in S. Apollonia.⁵⁰

⁴⁷The circular seal reads: ND (?) DI MILANO/ DOGANA/ GRANDE/ C..LLI (?). It has a small rosette at the centre. Another sticker records a restoration, unfortunately undated: E.A. Blakenay Ltd (Late with Thos. Agnew & Sons) Picture Restorers and Framers, 6 St. Mary's Parsonage, Manchester.

⁴⁸The provenance and date: *Early Italian Paintings* 44, although Boskovits (1975) 362-366 dates it to 1390-95. For Offner's attribution: *Primitives to Picasso* 200.

⁴⁹For the artist: Maria Cristina Improta and Anna Padoa Rizzo, "Paolo Schiavo fornitore di disegni per ricami" *Rivista d'arte* 41 (1989) 25-56; Anna Padoa Rizzo, "Paolo Schiavo all'Antela" *Antichità viva* 22 (1983) 3-6; Anna Padoa Rizzo, "Aggiunte a Paolo Schiavo" *Antichità viva* 14 (1975) 3-8; Fremantle 523-532; Roberto Longhi, "Fatti di Masolino e Masaccio" *Critica d'arte* 25/26 (1940) 145-191, nt. 25; Vasari II, 266.

This small painting (fig. 93) is considerably different from other examples, and not only because it incorporates a relief plaque based on a model by Donatello.⁵¹ In the plaque, the Madonna is waist-length, and seen in right profile, holding the Child, who looks out at the viewer and reaches toward her breast with his hand. In the painted frame, God the Father appears in the gable above, holding an orb, while two angels flank the Madonna and Child and hold a billowing canopy above them. Eve is painted under the plaque, reclining with a fig branch and nude to the waist; below her "Ave Maria Gratia Plena" is written on the edge of the frame, and a prophet is pictured in the small corbel, holding a scroll.

The work was bought at Sotheby's in 1926, and had been in the collection of Lord Carmichael; there are hinges on both sides from lost wings.⁵² The frame's attribution to Paolo Schiavo was made by Philip Pouncey, and it is usually dated to about 1440, which makes it at least twenty-five or thirty years later than any other Mary/Eve painting.⁵³ And although the Eve is similar to those of earlier images, she seems primarily to be modeled on Ghiberti's Eve at the top of the Gates of Paradise of the Florentine Baptistery (fig. 94), probably in turn influenced by Ghiberti's admiration for Sienese Trecento painting, and especially Ambrogio Lorenzetti, which suggests a rather indirect line of transmission, or simply a reuse of figural models close

⁵⁰Padoa Rizzo (1975) 3-4.

⁵¹Unfortunately, most discussion of the work has focused on its sculptural aspects. See: Ulrich Middeldorf, "Some Florentine Painted Madonna Reliefs" *Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art*, eds. Wendy Stedman Sheard and John T. Paoletti (New Haven and London, 1978) 77-85, 78; John Pope-Hennessy with Ronald Lightbown, *Catalogue of Italian Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London, 1964) vols I and II: 83-84, catalogue 68, and figure 94; Philip Pouncey, "A Painted Frame by Paolo Schiavo" *BM* 88 (1946) 228; Guldán 135.

⁵²Pope-Hennessy 83.

⁵³Pouncey 228; Pope-Hennessy 84.

at hand.⁵⁴ As suggested in the Conclusion, it may be the imagery continued or had a mid-Quattrocento revival for domestic use, having become outdated due to changes in altarpiece iconography and design. There is a much larger but related work, attributed to the same artist, in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge, a niche tabernacle with the Virgin and Child, a funeral scene with a confraternity of flagellants, Sts. Francis, Jerome, Bernard, and Mary Magdalene, and the Fall in the console.⁵⁵

⁵⁴For this figure and its relations to the painted images of Eve: Richard Krautheimer, Lorenzo Ghiberti, 2nd ed. (Princeton, NJ, 1982) 172, who also discusses Ghiberti's interest in Trecento compositions and admiration for Ambrogio Lorenzetti.

⁵⁵J.W. Goodison and G.H. Robertson, Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge, Catalogue of Paintings, vol. II: Italian Schools (London, 1967) 122-124; its dimensions are 143.5 x 71.7 cm.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

Cortona, Biblioteca comunale, ms. 442 (540): F. Alticozzi, "Storia della famiglia Casali."

Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta, ms. 1941: Giuseppe Fabretti, "Memorie di Magione."

Siena, Archivio di Stato di Siena, Fondo Conventi, filze 161, 162, 163: "I Caleffi di San Galgano," compiled and transcribed c. 1319-21.

Rome, Archivium Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum, XII, 9002, buste 66-81, and 9003, busta 123.

II. PUBLISHED SOURCES

Alighieri, Dante. Divina Commedia: Inferno. 2 vols. Ed. and trans. Charles S. Singleton. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Alighieri, Dante. Divina Commedia: Purgatorio. 3 vols. Ed. and trans. Charles S. Singleton. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Alighieri, Dante. Divina Commedia: Paradiso. 3 vols. Ed. and trans. Charles S. Singleton. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Un'Antologia di restauri: 50 opere d'arte restaurate dal 1974 al 1981. Ex. Cat., Rome, Palazzo Barberini, 1982. Rome: Soprintendenza per i beni artistici e storici di Roma, 1982.

Arte e spiritualità nell'ordine agostiniano e il convento San Nicola a Tolentino. Tolentino: Biblioteca Egidiana, 1992.

Balan, Pietro. La ribellione di Perugia nel 1368 e la sua sottomissione nel 1370 narrata secondo i documenti degli archivi vaticani. Rome: Della Pace, 1880.

Bartoccioni, Trento. La Chiesa e l'affresco della Madonna delle Grazie, Magione. Assisi: Porziuncola, 1968.

Bartoccioni, Trento, ed. La Magione. Perugia: Comitato organizzatore per le feste giubilari, 1976.

La Basilica di San Gregorio Maggiore in Spoleto. Spoleto: Edizioni dell'Ente Rocca di Spoleto, 1979.

Baxandall, Michael. Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style. 2nd ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Baxandall, Michael. Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Benjamin, Walter. Illuminations: Essays and Reflections. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1969.

Berenson, Bernard. Italian Pictures of the Renaissance: Florentine School. 2 vols. London: Phaidon, 1963.

Berenson, Bernard. Italian Pictures of the Renaissance: Central Italian and North Italian Schools. 3 vols. London: Phaidon, 1968.

Bernard of Clairvaux. Opera. 7 vols. Eds. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais. Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1968.

Bernardini, Virginia, Andreina Draghi, and Guia Verdesi. Ss. Domenico e Sisto. Rome: Istituto Nazionale di studi romani, 1991.

Bernardino of Siena. Prediche volgari, dette nella piazza del Campo l'anno 1427. Ed. Luciano Banchi. 3 vols. Siena: S. Bernardino, 1880-1888.

Berthier, Joachim Joseph. Chroniques du monastère de San Sisto et de San Domenico e Sisto à Rome, écrites par trois religieuses du même monastère et traduites par un religieux dominicain. 2 vols. Levanto: Imprimerie de l'Immaculée, 1919.

Bologna, Federico. I pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli 1266-1414, e un riesame dell'arte nell'età fridericiana. Rome: Ugo Bozzi, 1969.

Bolton, Brenda M. "Daughters of Rome: All One in Christ Jesus" Women in the Church. Eds. W.J. Shields and Diana Wood. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990, 101-115.

Borsook, Eve, and Fiorella Gioffredi Superbi. The Italian Altarpiece 1250-1550: History, Technique, Style. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Borsook, Eve. Gli affreschi di Montesiepi. Florence: Edam, 1969.

- Boskovits, Miklòs. Pittura umbra e marchigiana fra Medioevo e Rinascimento. Florence: Edam, 1973.
- Boskovits, Miklòs. Pittura fiorentina alla viglia del Rinascimento, 1370-1400. Florence: Edam, 1975.
- Brentano, Robert. Rome Before Avignon: A Social History of Thirteenth-Century Rome. London: Longman, 1974.
- Brieger, Peter, Millard Meiss, and Charles Singleton. Illuminated Manuscripts of the Divine Comedy. 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Brogi, F. Inventario Generale degli oggetti d'arte della provincia di Siena. Siena: Carlo Nava per l'onorevole deputazione provinciale senese, 1897.
- Bulletin de la Société française d'études mariales 12-15 (1954, 1955, 1956, 1957): 4 issues devoted to the theme "Marie, La Nouvelle Eve."
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion. New York: Zone Books, 1991.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Caesarius of Heisterbach. The Dialogue on Miracles. Trans. H. von E. Scott and C.C. Swinton Bland. 2 vols. London: George Routledge and sons, 1929.
- Caleca, Antonino, et al. Pisa: Museo delle Sinopie del Camposanto Monumentale. Pisa: Opera della Primaziale Pisana, 1979.
- Camille, Michael. "Seeing and Reading: Some Visual Implications of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy" Art History 8 (1985): 26-49.
- Canestrelli, Antonio. L'Abbazia di S. Galgano: Monografia storico-artistica con documenti inediti e numerose illustrazioni. Florence: Alinari, 1896; anastatic reprint, Pistoia: Tellini, 1993.
- Cannon, Joanna Louise. "Dominican Patronage of the Arts in Central Italy: the *Provincia Romana*, c.1220-c.1320." Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1980.

- Cardini, Franco. Leggenda di S. Galgano Confessore, testo volgare inedito del XIV secolo. San Galgano e la spada nella roccia. Siena: Cantagalli, 1982.
- Cardini, Franco. Guerre di primavera: Studi sulla cavalleria e la tradizione cavalleresca. Florence: Le Lettere, 1992.
- Carli, Enzo. Il Duomo di Orvieto. Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1965.
- Carli, Enzo. Le Sculture del Duomo di Orvieto. Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d'arti grafiche, 1947.
- Carli, Enzo, and Paolo E. Arias. Il Camposanto di Pisa. Rome: Libreria dello stato, 1937.
- Carocci, Sandro. Baroni di Roma: Dominazioni signorili e lignaggi aristocratici nel Duecento e nel primo Trecento. Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 1993.
- Casagrande, Carla. Prediche alle donne del secolo XIII. Milan: Bompiani, 1978.
- Cassidy, Brendan, ed. Iconography at the Crossroads. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Castelnuovo, Enrico, ed. La pittura in Italia. Il Duecento e il Trecento. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Milan: Electa, 1986.
- I ceti dirigenti nella Toscana tardo comunale. Atti del III convegno di studi, Firenze, 5-7 dicembre, 1980. Florence: Francesco Papafava, 1983.
- Cignelli, Lino. Maria nuova Eva nella Patristica greca (secc. II-V). Assisi: Porziuncola, 1966.
- Cleveland Museum of Art European Paintings Before 1500: Catalogue of Paintings, Part One. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1974.
- Coathalem, Hervé. Le Parallelisme entre la Sainte Vierge et l'Eglise dans la tradition latine jusqu'à la fin du XIIe siècle. Rome: Aedes Universitatis Gregoriana, 1954.
- Coor, Gertrude. "Bemerkungen zu einem ungewöhnlichen italienischen Triptychon in der Niedersächsischen Landesgalerie Hannover" Niederdeutsche Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte 2 (1962): 152-171.
- Concioni, Graziano, Claudio Ferri, and Giuseppe Ghilarducci. Arte e pittura nel medioevo lucchese. Lucca: Matteoni, 1994.

- Crowe, J.A., and G.B. Cavalcaselle. A History of Painting in Italy. 6 vols. London: John Murray, 1903-1914.
- Dale, Sharon. Lippo Vanni: Style and Iconography. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1985.
- Dal Prà, Laura, ed. Bernardo di Chiaravalle nell'arte italiana dal XIV al XVIII secolo. Milan: Electa, 1990.
- de Fontette, Micheline. Les religieuses à l'âge classique du droit canon. Paris: J. Vrin, 1967.
- della Cella, Alberto. Cortona antica: notizie archeologiche, storiche, artistiche. Cortona: Sociale, 1900.
- Dominici, Giovanni. Lettere spirituali. Eds. M-T Casella and G. Pozzi. Freiburg: Edizioni Universitarie, 1969.
- Donati, Claudio. L'idea di nobiltà in Italia, secoli XIV-XVIII. Rome and Bari: Laterza, 1988.
- Donati, Pier Paolo. "Inediti orvietani del Trecento" Paragone 229 (1969): 3-17.
- Dunkerton, Jill, et al. Giotto to Dürer: Early Renaissance Painting in The National Gallery. New Haven and London: Yale University Press in association with National Gallery Publications, 1991.
- Dupré Theseider, E. "La rivolta di Perugia nel 1375 contro l'abate di Monmaggiore ed i suoi precedenti politici" Bolletino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria 35 (1938): 69-166.
- Esche, Sigrid. Adam und Eva: Sündenfall und Erlösung. Dusseldorf: L. Schwann, 1957.
- Feher, Michel, ed., with Ramona Naddaff and Nadia Tazi. Fragments for a History of the Human Body. 3 vols. New York: Zone Books, 1989.
- Flores d'Arcais, Francesca. Guariento: tutta la pittura. Venice: Alfieri, 1980.
- Forte, Stefano L. "Il Cardinale Matteo Orsini OP e il suo testamento" Archivium Fratrum Praedicatorum 37 (1967): 181-262.
- Fratini, Corrado. "Percorso nel lungo 'Tracciato orvietano' della pittura medievale (secc. XIII-XIV)" Bollettino dell'Istituto Storico Artistico Orvietano 39 (1983): 169-184.

- Fremantle, Richard. Florentine Gothic Painters from Giotto to Masaccio: A Guide to Painting in and near Florence 1300-1450. London: Martin Secker and Warburg, 1975.
- Freuler, Gaudenz. Bartolo di Fredi Cini: Ein Beitrag zur sienesischen Malerei des 14. Jahrhunderts. Disentis: Desertina, 1994.
- Freuler, Gaudenz. Biagio di Goro Ghezzi a Paganico: L'affresco nell'abside della Chiesa di S. Michele. Florence: Electa, 1986.
- Gardner, Julian. Patrons, Painters and Saints: Studies in Medieval Italian Painting. Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1993.
- Gardner, Julian. "Nuns and Altarpieces: Agendas for Research" Römisches Jahrbuch 30 (1995): 27-57.
- Gardner, Julian. "The Stefaneschi Altarpiece: A Reconsideration" Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 37 (1974): 57-103.
- Gesta 31/2 (1992), special issue: "Monastic Architecture for Women".
- Giordano of Pisa. Quadresimale fiorentino 1305-1306. Ed. Carlo Delcorno. Florence: Sansoni, 1974.
- Goldthwaite, Richard A. Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy 1300-1600. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Gnoli, Umberto. Pittori e miniatori nell'Umbria. Spoleto: Claudio Argentieri, 1923.
- Gnoli, Umberto. Topografia e topomastica di Roma medioevale e moderna. Rome: Staderini, 1939.
- Goetz, Oswald. Der Feigenbaum in der religiösen Kunst des Abendlandes. Berlin: Mann, 1965.
- Gordon, Dillian. "Art in Umbria c.1250-1350." Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1979.
- Il Gotico a Siena. Miniature, pitture, oreficerie, oggetti d'arte. Ex cat, Siena, Palazzo Pubblico 24 luglio-30 ottobre 1982. Firenze: Centro Di, 1982.
- Graef, Hilda. Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion. 2 vols. London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

- Gripkey, Sister Mary Vincentine. "Marian Legends in Italian Manuscripts in the Major Libraries of Italy" Medieval Studies 14 (1952): 9-47 and 15 (1953): 14-47.
- Grohmann, Alberto. Città e territorio tra medioevo ed età moderna (Perugia secc. XIII-XVI). Perugia: Volumnia, 1981.
- Grondona, Marco. Una città e la sua memoria: Todi nell'invenzione iconografica e nella figura d'un *locus celeber*. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 1991.
- Guignard, Philippe. Les Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne. Dijon: J-E Rabutot, 1878.
- Guldan, Ernst. Eva und Maria: Eine Antithese als Bildmotiv. Graz-Cologne: Hermann Böhlau, 1966.
- Gutierrez, David. Los Agustinos en la edad media 1256-1356. Rome: Institutum Historicum Ordinis Fratrum S. Augustini, 1980.
- Hinnebusch, William A. The History of the Dominican Order I: Origins and Growth to 1500. New York: Alba House, 1966.
- Hood, William. Fra Angelico at San Marco. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Housely, Norman. The Avignon Papacy and the Crusades, 1305-1378. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.
- Housely, Norman. The Italian Crusades: the Papal Angevin Alliance and the Crusades against Christian Lay Powers, 1254-1343. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Humfrey, Peter, and Martin Kemp, eds. The Altarpiece in the Renaissance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Jacobus de Voragine. The Golden Legend. Readings on the Saints. 2 vols. Trans. William Granger Ryan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Jugie, Martin. La Mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge: Etude Historico-Doctrinale. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1944.
- Kaftal, George. Iconography of the Saints in Tuscan Painting. Florence: Sansoni, 1952.

- Kaftal, George. Iconography of the Saints in Central and South Italian Schools of Painting. Florence: Sansoni, 1965.
- Kartsonis, Anna D. Anastasis: The Making of an Image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Kent, F.W., and Patricia Simons with J.Eade, eds. Patronage, Art, and Society in Renaissance Italy. Canberra and Oxford: Humanities Research Centre and Clarendon Press, 1987.
- King, Georgiana Goddard. "The Virgin of Humility" Art Bulletin 17 (1935): 474-491.
- Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane. Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Italy. Trans. Lydia Cochrane. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Krautheimer, Richard, with Trude Krautheimer-Hess. Lorenzo Ghiberti. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Kryger, Karin, Louise Lillie and Søren Kaspersen, eds. Kvindebilleder: Eva, Maria og andre kvindemotiver i middelalderen. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989.
- Ladis, Andrew. "Immortal Queen and Mortal Bride: The Marian Imagery of Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Cycle at Montesiepi" Gazette des Beaux-arts, 119 (1992): 189-200.
- Ladis, Andrew. Taddeo Gaddi. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1982.
- Leisch-Kiesl, Monika. Eva als Andere: Eine exemplarische Untersuchung zu Frühchristentum und Mittelalter. Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Bohlau, 1992.
- Leone de Castris, Pierluigi. Arte di corte nella Napoli angioina. Florence: Cantini, 1986.
- Levi d'Ancona, Mirella. The Iconography of the Immaculate Conception in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance. New York: College Art Association of America, 1957.
- Libanori, Antonio. Vita del Glorioso San Galgano eremita cisterciense. Siena: Bonetti, 1645.

- Litta, Pompeo. Famiglie celebri di Italia. 7 vols., 3 supplements. Milan: Paolo Emilio Giusti, 1819-1867.
- Longhi, Roberto. "Tracciato orvietano" Paragone 149 (1962): 3-14.
- Mancini, Girolamo. Cortona nel medio evo. Florence: G. Carnesecchi e figli, 1897.
- Marcucci, Luisa. I Dipinti toscani del secolo XIV: Le Gallerie Nazionali di Firenze. Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1965.
- Martindale, Andrew. Simone Martini Oxford: Phaidon, 1988.
- Matter, E. Ann. The Voice of My Beloved: the Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- Meiss, Millard. Painting in Florence and Siena After the Black Death. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1951.
- Migiel, Marilyn, and Juliana Schiesari, eds. Refiguring Woman: Perspectives on Gender and the Italian Renaissance. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Miles, Margaret R. Carnal Knowing: Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Moretti, Mario, and Pietro Zampetti. S. Severino Marche: Museo e Pinacoteca. Bologna: Calderini, 1992.
- Mori, Edouardo and Paolo. Guida storico artistica al Museo Diocesano di Cortona. Cortona: Calosci, 1995.
- Newton, Stella Mary. Fashion in the Age of the Black Prince. Woodbridge: Baydell, 1980.
- Noffke, Suzanne, ed. and trans. The Letters of St. Catherine of Siena. 2 vols. Binghampton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1988.
- Norman, Diana, ed. Siena, Florence and Padua: Art, Society and Religion 1280-1400. 2 vols. New Haven and London: Yale University Press in association with the Open University, 1995.
- Norman, Diana. "The Commission for the Frescoes of Montesièpi" Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 56 (1993): 289-300.

- Norman, Diana. "'In the Beginning was the Word:' An Altarpiece by Ambrogio Lorenzetti for the Augustinian Hermits of Massa Marittima" Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 4 (1995): 478-503.
- Oertel, Robert. Frühe italienische Malerei in Altenburg. Berlin: Henschelverlag Kunst und Gesellschaft, 1961.
- Pagels, Elaine. Adam, Eve, and the Serpent. New York: Random House, 1988.
- Partner, Peter. The Lands of Saint Peter: The Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance. London: Eyre Methuen, 1972.
- Pásztor, Edith. "I Papi del Duecento e Trecento di fronte alla vita religiosa femminile" Rusconi, Il movimento religioso femminile in Umbria, 29-65.
- Pecchiai, Pio. La Chiesa dello Spirito Santo dei Napoletani e l'antica chiesa di S. Aurea in via Giulia. Rome: Ugo Pinnaro, 1953.
- Pecugi Fop, Maria. "Il Comune di Perugia e la Chiesa durante il periodo avignonese con particolare riferimento all'Albornoz" Bollettino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria 65/2 (1968): 5-102.
- Pellini, Pompeo. Dell'Historia di Perugia. 3 vols. Venice: Gio. Giacomo Hertz, 1664; anastatic reprint Bologna: Forni, 1970.
- Polverari, Michele. Carlo da Camerino: 24 giugno-29 ottobre, 1989. Ancona: Pinacoteca Comunale Francesco Podesti, 1989.
- Polverari, Michele. La Circoncisione: una tavola attribuita a Carlo da Camerino. Ancona: Pinacoteca Comunale Francesco Podesti, 1988.
- Prigent, Pierre. Apocalypse 12: Histoire de l'exégèse. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959.
- Restauro nelle Marche: Testimonianze acquisti e recuperi. Urbino: Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, 1973.
- Reydellet-Guttinger, Chantal. L'Administration pontificale dans le Duché de Spolète (1305-1352). Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1975.
- Ricci, Ettore. Ricordo delle feste solenni del SS. Crocifisso e della Madonna delle Grazie celebrate in Magione nell'Archidiocesi di Perugia dal XXI al XXVIII Agosto MDCCCCXXI. Numero unico, Magione, 21 agosto

1221. Reprinted in La Magione. Ed. Trento Bartoccioni. Perugia: Comitato organizzatore per le feste giubilari, 1976, 250-276.

Riganelli, Giovanni. Pian di Carpine: La storia nella microstoria. Perugia: Salvi, 1985.

Rusconi, Roberto, ed. Il movimento religioso femminile in Umbria nei secoli XIII-XIV: Atti del convegno internazionale di studio. Florence and Perugia: Regione dell'Umbria and Nuova Alfa, 1984.

Röhrich, Lutz. Adam und Eva: das erste Menschenpaar in Volkskunst und Volksdichtung. Stuttgart: Muller and Schnadler, 1968.

Rowley, George. Ambrogio Lorenzetti. 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Rowley, George. "The Gothic Frescos at Monte Siepi" Art Studies 7 (1929): 107-127.

Russel, H. Diane, with Bernardine Barnes, eds. Eva/Ave: Woman in Renaissance and Baroque Prints. Washington, DC and New York: The National Gallery of Art and Feminist Press at CUNY, 1990.

Salimei, Franco. I Salimbeni di Siena. Rome: Editalia, 1986.

Schiller, Gertrud. Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst. Band 4,2: Maria. Gutersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1980.

Schmidt, Victor M. "Artistic Imagination versus Religious Function: Ambrogio Lorenzetti's Annunciation at Montesiepi" The Power of Imagery: Essays on Rome, Italy, and the Imagination. Peter van Kessel, ed. Sant'Oreste(Rome): Apeiron, 1993, 133-148, appendix 295-296.

Schneider, Feodor. "Der Einsiedler Galgan von Chiusdino und die Anfänge von S. Galgano" Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken 17 (1914-24): 61-77.

Emma Simi Varanelli, "Spiritualità mendicante e iconografia mariana: il contributo dell'ordine agostiniano alla genesi e alle metamorfosi iconologiche della Madonna dell'Umiltà" Arte e spiritualità nell'ordine agostiniano, 77-99.

Shorr, Dorothy C. The Christ Child in Devotional Images in Italy during the XIV Century. New York: George Wittenborn, 1954.

Steinberg, Leo. The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and in Modern Oblivion. New York: Pantheon/October, 1983; first published as October 25 (Summer 1983).

Storia dell'arte italiana. 12 vols. Turin: Einaudi, 1979-1983.

Storia d'Italia. 24 vols. Ed. Giuseppe Galasso. Turin: UTET, 1980-1995.

Susi, Eugenio. L'eremita cortese. S. Galgano fra mito e storia nell'agiografia toscana del XII secolo. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 1993.

Theiner, Augustin, ed. Codex diplomaticus Domini Temporalis S. Sedis. 2 vols. Rome: Imprimerie du Vatican, 1862.

Thérel, Marie-Louise. Le Triomphe de la Vierge-Eglise: A l'origine du décor du portail occidental de Notre-Dame de Senlis, Sources historiques, littéraires et iconographiques. Paris: CNRS, 1984.

Todini, Filippo. La Pittura umbra dal Duecento al primo Cinquecento. 2 vols. Milan: Longanesi, 1989.

Toesca, Pietro. Il Trecento. Turin: UTET, 1964.

Torriti, Piero. La Pinacoteca Nazionale di Siena: i dipinti. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Genoa: Sagep, 1980.

Trexler, Richard. "Florentine religious experience: the sacred image" Studies in the Renaissance 19 (1972): 7-41.

Trexler, Richard C. Public Life in Renaissance Florence. New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Trexler, Richard C. "Le célibat à la fin du Moyen Age: Les religieuses de Florence." Annales ESC 27 (1972): 1329-1350.

Van Marle, Raimond. The Development of the Italian Schools of Painting. 18 vols and indices. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1923-1936.

van Os, Henk. Marias Demut und Verherrlichung in der sienesischen Malerei 1300-1450. s'Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij, 1969.

van Os, Henk. Sieneese Altarpieces 1215-1460: Form, Content, Function. 2 Vols. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1990.

van Os, Henk. Studies in Early Tuscan Painting. London: Pindar, 1992.

- Vasari, Giorgio. Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori, 9 vols. Ed. Gaetano Milanesi. Florence: Sansoni, 1875-1885.
- Verdier, Philippe. Le Couronnement de la Vierge: Les origines et les premiers développements d'un thème iconographique. Montreal and Paris: Institut Albert-le-Grand, 1980.
- Verdon, Timothy, and John Henderson, eds. Christianity and the Renaissance: Images and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990.
- von Erffa, Hans Martin. Ikonologie der Genesis: Die christlichen Bildthemen aus dem Alten Testament und ihre Quellen. Vol. 1 of 2. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1989.
- Warnke, Martin. The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist. Trans. David McLintock. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Wenzel, Siegfried, ed. and trans. Fasciculus Morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher's Handbook. University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989.
- Werckmeister, O.K. "The Lintel Fragment Representing Eve from Saint-Lazare, Autun" Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 35 (1972): 1-30.
- Zampetti, Pietro. Pittura nelle Marche. 4 vols. Florence: Nardini, 1988.
- Zeri, Federico, ed. La Pittura in Italia. Il Quattrocento. Milan: Electa, 1986.
- Zeri, Federico. "Tre argomenti umbri" Bollettino d'arte 68 (1963): 29-45.
- Zucchi, Alberto. Roma domenicana: Note storiche. Vol I. Florence: Edizioni della Rivista "Memorie domenicane," 1938.

MISSING PAGES
REMOVED ON
INSTRUCTION
FROM THE
UNIVERSITY